

JOHN LONGLAND AND ROGER EDGEWORTH, TWO FORGOTTEN PREACHERS OF THE EARLY SIXTEENTH CENTURY

By J. W. BLENCH

I

THE remark of Dr. Tillyard, made a few years ago, that 'early Tudor prose is one of the least explored and most underprized areas of English literature',¹ is unfortunately still true today. In the field of sacred oratory, the great names of Fisher² and Latimer still stand in lonely eminence, the former as the exponent of the humanistic, consciously rhetorical 'Ciceronian' manner,³ which led to Tindale's gibe that Rochester was an 'orator'; the latter as the much-loved protagonist of a racy and often humorous colloquialism. However, as I hope to show, this period can boast of two other notable preachers, of equal rank with the well-known masters; John Longland, with his use of rhetorical schemes and consciously elaborated rhythms, standing with Fisher; Roger Edgeworth, with his frequent vigorous use of popular speech idiom, taking his place beside Latimer, although he has too, as we shall see, moving passages of set eloquence exhibiting a depth of feeling and poetic beauty which Latimer cannot attain. An examination of the works of these two neglected preachers will not only furnish a missing chapter in literary history, but also provide, by an indication of the characteristic attitudes expressed, an interesting comment on the tone and quality of the religious life of the time.⁴

John Longland (1473-1547) had been Master of Magdalene Hall, Oxford, Dean of Salisbury, and then a Canon of Windsor, before Henry VIII, in

¹ Preface to Thomas Starkey, *A Dialogue between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset*, ed. Kathleen M. Burton (London, 1948).

² It is worth pointing out here that the E.E.T.S. edition of *The English Works of John Fisher*, Part I, ed. John E. B. Mayor (1876, reprinted 1935), does not contain the interesting sermons in *Hereafter ensueth two fruytfull sermons*, W. Rastell, 1532, S.T.C. 10909—both on Matt. v. 20.

³ Cf. G. P. Krapp, *The Rise of English Literary Prose* (New York, 1915), ch. iv, pp. 166-8.

⁴ It is remarkable that books on the 'Eve of the Reformation' should make so little use of the evidence contained in the numerous sermons of the time, both manuscript and printed. Even Philip Hughes's recent *The Reformation in England*, vol. i, *The King's Proceedings* (London, 1950), neglects the evidence of the sermons. Pierre Janelle's *L'Angleterre Catholique à la veille du Schisme* (Paris, 1935) does indeed devote a few pages to sermons (pp. 19-32), but the conclusions are based only on such well-known manuals as the *Festial* of John Mirk, the *Speculum Christiani*, the *Pupilla Oculi*, and the *Exornatorium Curatorum*. The somewhat mystical devotional and instructional books, as R. Whitford's *Werke for Householdiers* (1530), or Hilton's ever popular *Scale of Perfection*, which all ecclesiastical historians adduce, give only one side of the picture.

whose favour he grew, 'for his excellent way of preaching', made him Royal Confessor, and in 1521 secured his appointment to the bishopric of Lincoln. His works in English are three Good Friday sermons, preached at Court in 1535, 1536, and 1538;¹ while in Latin there are *Tres Conciones* (occasional sermons; a visitation sermon at Westminster Abbey, 1519, a sermon preached at the laying of the foundation-stone of Cardinal College, Oxford, 1525, and one preached against Luther, 1527); *Quinque Sermones* (sermons on the Fridays of Lent 1517, preached before the king); and a series of expository *Sermones* on the Penitential Psalms, also delivered before Henry, ending with one on Psalm ci (A.V. cii).² Bale declares that these last were translated from English into Latin by Thomas Key,³ although this is nowhere stated in the editions themselves. However, it is probable that all the sermons were originally preached in English, except the *Tres Conciones*, which as they were delivered *ad clerum* may have been spoken in Latin. In any event most of the quotations in this essay have been drawn from the English sermons, although frequent references have been given to parallel passages in the Latin.

Roger Edgeworth (d. 1560), the second preacher whose works will be considered, was elected a Fellow of Oriel in 1508; in 1526 he received his D.D., and in 1542 was made Prebendary of the second stall of the newly constituted cathedral of Bristol. He was also a canon of Salisbury and Wells, and in 1554 was made chancellor of Wells. His sermons are found in a volume published in 1557, but all except the last three were actually preached in Henry's time.⁴ They consist of a series on the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, preached at Redcliffe Cross in Bristol, a homily on the Apostles' Creed, a homily on Ceremonies, and an expository series on the First Epistle of St. Peter preached in the Cathedral at Bristol. It is unfortunate that Edgeworth was unable to execute his design of publishing a further volume,⁵ but the one which is extant is sufficient to give a clear indication

¹ *A Sermond made befor the kyng at Rychemunte, vppon good fryday MCCCCXXXVI* (London, probably 1535; cf. *T.L.S.*, 31 Dec. 1931). *A sermond spoken before the kyng at Grenewiche vpon good Fridaye MDXXXVI*, London, 1536. *A sermonde made before the Kyng at Grenewiche, vpon good Fridaye, MDXXXVIII*, London, 1538.

² *J. Longlondi, Dei gratia Lincolniensis Episcopi, tres conciones*, London, 1527?—contains also *Quinque Sermones*. There is some confusion about the *Sermones* in the current bibliographies. They were issued in successive years, but the pagination is consecutive; the full contents are as follows: Ps. vi, ff. 1-52, Pynson, 1518; Ps. xxxi, ff. 53-109; Ps. xxxvii, ff. 109-98, 1520; Ps. i, ff. 198-351, 1521; Ps. ci, ff. 351-864, Redman, 1532. Unfortunately, there is not a copy of the whole book in any one library; the parts are scattered among the various main libraries.

³ *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Britanniae* (Basel, 1557), p. 713.

⁴ *Sermons very Fruitfull, Godly and Learned*, R. Caly, 1557. Edgeworth informs us at the beginning of the eighteenth sermon on St. Peter's first Epistle that he had abstained from preaching for five or six years, i.e. during the reign of Edward VI, and that this particular series is resumed after a break of eight or nine years.

⁵ 'I haue beside these many sermons, made in verie solempne audiences on the dominical

of his manner, and is indeed of such high literary merit as to warrant a modern scholarly edition. Both Longland and Edgeworth accepted the Royal Supremacy, but otherwise upheld Catholic doctrines; they stood with Bonner and Gardiner in the conservative Henrician party.

II

When we begin to examine the style, we find that the schematic form of these two preachers differs significantly. Longland, except in his series on the Penitential Psalms, preserves a modified version of the learned 'scheme': exordium, division of the text, development, and conclusion.¹ Although his use of the scheme is much freer than the extreme rigidity and elaboration found in the Franciscan Observant Stephen Baron's learned Latin sermons preached before Cambridge University about 1508,² nevertheless it forms the groundwork of his arrangement. It is interesting to note that nowhere does he attempt an adaptation of the form of the classical oration, as Fisher had done in his funeral sermon for Henry VII—in this particular he is more medieval than the earlier preacher. Edgeworth, on the other hand, looks towards the newer, simpler methods of construction. In his series on the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, he adopts a simple topical treatment, dealing in an expository manner with each in turn, while in the sermons on St. Peter's first Epistle, he proceeds *secundum ordinem textus*, to elaborate the literal meaning, and to give explanatory 'background' information, in the manner of Colet, as in this presentation of Mediterranean geography, the nautical details of which would no doubt come home to the sailors in his audience. Dealing with the entrance to the sea, he speaks of Calys Malys, a mountain in Granada:

Ill Calys, because of a great multitude of ragged rockes linge in the thresholde or bottom of the saide gate, so that when any ship shall passe in or oute at the saide streicte, the mariners must be sure of an highe water, and a measurable winde, els they shall finde it an yll passage and perilous.³

Longland's form in his series on the Penitential Psalms is simpler than is usual with him. His treatment of them is more copious than Fisher's,⁴ but less individual. He goes through each psalm verse by verse, expanding

epistles and gospels, some in the Vniuersitie of Oxforde, some at Paules crosse in London, some in the courte afore my mooste honourable Lorde and Maister kinge Henry the eighte, some in the cathedrall church of welles, where hath bene euer sith I knewe it a solemne and a well learned audience, whiche I purpose (God willinge) to set forth hereafter, as I maye haue oportunitie.' Preface to *Sermons*.

¹ Cf. G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Mediaeval England* (Cambridge, 1926), ch. viii, pp. 316-26.

² *Sermones declamati coram alma vniuersitate Cantabrigiensi, per venerandum patrem fratrem Stephanum baronis*. . . London, Wynkyn de Worde.

³ *Sermons*, f. 168^r.

⁴ The sermon on Ps. ci is particularly long, running to 513 pages.

the meaning, adding in places 'spiritual' interpretations, citing concordant texts together with relevant *dicta* of the Fathers and Schoolmen (especially Scotus and the *Glossa Ordinaria*); giving appropriate quotations from the classical Latin writers (particularly Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, and Seneca) whose works are used as mere quarries for moral sayings; but offering virtually nothing new or personal. Indeed this whole series is only a mosaic of well-applied authorities, stock similes, and traditional attitudes.¹ However, the very elaboration, together with the elegance of the presentation, makes this group of sermons a fascinating quarry for the lore and outlook of a representative exponent of the Old Learning at a time when it was so shortly to be swept away in England.²

In style, Longland is more consciously rhetorical than Edgeworth, but his diction is simply English, he has few 'augmented' terms, and is without the latinized forms of Fisher.³ His most striking device is his frequent and felicitous use of question and answer (*rogatio*), as in the following exposition of a text from St. Paul: 'Propter nimiam caritatem qua dilexit nos, deus, cum essemus mortui peccatis, convivificavit nos in Christo.' (Eph. ii. 4-5.) Having said that God allowed Christ to die for love, Longland proceeds:

What loue? For the loue he bare to hym selfe? Nay, Nay. It was the inestimable loue he bare vnto vs, *Propter nimiam (inquit) charitatem qua dilexit nos.* What dyde he by this loue? *Convivificauit nos CHRISTO.* He reuyued vs agen in Christe, frome deathe to life. Howe? *Christo.* In Christe and by Christe.⁴

This is simple exposition made more forceful; the device is also used for emotive effect, as in the following cumulative passage on the power of the devil, where, as often, it is coupled with patterned repetition:

For if he mought haue his swynge, if he mought haue as muche libertye and power ouer ye synner as his desior is: who shulde escape his hande? who shulde liue till to morowe? who shulde goo free? fewe, fewe, fewe or noon. Our lyuynge is suche, our wretchednesse is soo grette, our deadys ar soo synneful in the syght of god: that if itt were nott for his defendynge mercy, we shulde be sone att a poynte, sone destroyed, sone rydde out of this worlde.⁵

¹ The treatment of the birds in the verse, 'Similis factus sum pellicano solitudinis, factus sum sicut nycticorax in domicilio, vigilavi et factus sum sicut passer solitarius in tecto' (Ps. ci. 7-8) is typical. The pelican lives alone in the desert, the owl in holes in walls, and the sparrow, although lustful by nature, sometimes remains alone chaste on the rooftop—so, 'By these three birds, living in lonely habitations, three orders of true penitents are signified. The first, in doing penance, completely leaves the world; the second leaves it only partly, while the third, remaining in the world, seeks salvation there, with periodic groanings and sighs of repentance. This threefold penance is proper to three states of men. The first is that of solitaries, of anchorites or hermits; the second that of monks living in a convent; the third that of those who live well in the world.' *Sermones*, f. 405^v.

² Cf. section III of this essay.

³ Cf. the list given in Mayor's edition, p. xxix.

⁴ *Sermond at Grenewiche*, 1536, sig. Aii^v.

⁵ *Sermond at Rychemunte*, 1535, sig. Cii^r. Cf. too *Sermones*, f. 356^r.

He can use a series of rhetorical questions at great length, but with striking power, as in this passage of set eloquence on the observance of Good Friday, which incidentally shows that although joyful festivals were celebrated with great pomp and display, nevertheless a rigorous asceticism was found at this season among some at least of the courtiers themselves:

Yf it be so hygh a day, where are the sygnes & tokens of the feaste? where is the solempne ryngynge of belles to matyns, to masse, to euensong, to diuine service? Where are the solempnytyes of the masses sayd & songe as in other festyuall dayes? Where are the solempne songes of discant, pricked song, faburden, square note, regalles & organs? Where are your warblynge voyces, reeches & pleasant reportes in your syngynges? Where are the ryche ornaments of the aulters, the ryche vestimentes, coopes plaate and iewels, wont vpon such dayes to be set vpon the aulters? Where is the great welfare, the great dynners, the double seruyce, the delicate meates & drynkes on suche festiuall dayes wonte to be vsed? Where are your musicall Instrumentes of all sortes, and youre blowynges to dynner with trumpettes? Where are your harpes, your lutes, your cymballes, your flutes, your tabrettes, your drumslades and dowcymers? Where are your vialles, your rebeckes, your shakebushes: and your swete softe pleasant pypes? Where are your merye communicacyons, your mery iestes, fables and taales wonte to be had at your table for merye pastyme on soche dayes? . . . This day for precyous apparell, some weareth sacke clothe, some heere next vnto theyr bodyes. Some gothe wolwarde, some baare legged, baare footed lyke greate penitents, & not lyke as men gothe a holydayes in precyous apparell. But blacke, blacke: in blacke in token of our synnes, for whiche Chryst dyed.¹

The simple diction of the above will have been noted; in the following passage there is a subtle breaking up of a scriptural text,² which anticipates the mode of Andrewes, but the physical cruelty of the Jews is conveyed with colloquial immediacy:

And he saythe, *Tradidit*. He dyde traade and gyue hym. This *tradere*, is more than *dare*. For *dare*, is to gyue, but *Tradere* is *dare in potestatem*. *Tradere* is to gyue into a mannes power, to vse the thyng yt is gyue at his or theyr own pleasures to whome it is giuen, to do with it euen what they wyll: as ye wyll saye, to make or marre, to vse at libertie. And so dyde the fadre of heuen for our sake, he gaue his sone Christe into the handes & power of the Iewes, to vse hym and do with hym what they wolde: to handle: to treate, to haale, to lugge, to beate, to scourdge, to cutte, to mangle, to crucifye, and cruelly to put to deathe. And so for this cause *Tradidit illum*. He put hym holly into theyr handes for our saluacyon, to do with him what they wold, and so they dyde.³

It was well for Longland that he adopted such a vernacular diction, for although a master like Fisher was successful with latinized forms, lesser

¹ *Sermonde at Grenewiche*, 1538, sig. Kiii'.

² Rom. viii. 32. 'Proprio filio suo non pepercit sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum.'

³ *Sermond at Grenwiche*, 1536, sig. Aiii'.

men could produce such tasteless inflation as the following passage on the Incarnation, from a manuscript sermon of this period:

Butt when euerythyng was in extreme distresse and disparede return to light our blissede savior Ihesu crist which is the very light of trawth procedyde by temporall nativite from the wom of hys immaculat moder mary. Wher adumbrat ye light of his dyvyne nature inaccessible he sconsede his high mageste by thassumpcion of our humanite by the whych as thorough a lantern he exhibyt the beamis of his eternal veritie. So wth rutylyant splendour of his infynyt mercy, *visitavit nos oriens ex alto illuminare his qui in tenebris et umbra mortis sedent*.¹

Longland's sermons, like Fisher's, abound in similes and *exempla*, although both are sparing in their use of narrations.² On the whole, Longland's *exempla* are less individual than Fisher's, the majority belonging to the great common store of the sermon handbooks. However, they are always extremely apt, as this moralization of 'natural' history (I translate):

Let us not then usurp God's office, nor mete out the most extreme punishments, as some are wont to do, not unlike the Billanus which after it has killed a man listens for a long time afterwards in case he is still breathing, lest by chance it should leave him alive.³

Also, he almost always makes these illustrations fully his own, as in the following exhortation to frequent confession lest the habits of sin grow strong:

Example we may take by twoo pure syluer basons. Fyll them bothe full of filthe, and euery day voyde the filthe oute of oon of them & washe hym clene, & agen fyll hym full of fylthe, & agen washe hym, and soo often, and yet at the yeres ende, thy bason shall by thy often washing be clene. But the other bason whiche standeth all the yere full of fylth and not clensed, caste it out at the yeres ende, and washe hym, rubbe hym, scower hym, & doo thy beste: and yet thou shalte not make hym clene. For by longe lyinge of the fylthe in it, hit cankers and fretes in to the bason, soo that rubbynge and scouryng wyll not fetche it awaye.⁴

So too in this expansion of the Apostles being accounted of no reputation, *abjectissimi*:

¹ MS. Harl. 3118, f. 117'. This sermon which is on 'truth' contains a rhetorical attack on Luther: other notably inflated passages occur on ff. 115', 120', 123'.

² One of the best instances of Longland's use of narrations is the dream of the rich benefactor of convents and monasteries who is asked by Christ, 'But what did you suffer for me?' and his terrified confusion; *Sermones*, f. 780'; another is the vision of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament vouchsafed to the king, taken from the 'History of Edward the Confessor', *ibid.*, f. 346'.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 387'. Cf. too the figure of the glass which when empty gives out a sound if struck, but is silent when full of wine, applied to the groanings under adversity of the spiritually void, and the uncomplaining patience of those who are full of the wine of the Holy Spirit. *Quinque Sermones*, f. 85'.

⁴ *Sermond at Rychemunte*, 1535, sig. Kiii'.

... reputed butt as a rotten parte or as ye paryng of an aple, or as ye duste that is swepte out of the house & throwen in to a corner behinde the doore to be caste to the dunghill.¹

Sometimes we catch, perhaps, a more personal note, as in this delightful picture of the well-spring of the mercy of God:

For he euer contynually floweth, he euer issueth, he bobbullys and sprynges, & dothe euer abundantly runne out of hym mercy & propiciation: so that euery man, euery woman may resorte to hym, and fyll ther pottes and fyll ther vessels as often as they wyll. And yet shall they neuer drawe drye this abundante sprynge, thys plentefull welle of the mercy of God, unless yt be *propter ingrati-tudinem*, for vnkyndenes.²

—or in this illustration of how a sinful life bars out the effects of the redemption:

They doo as he that is in a house, wher the wyndous ar open & the sone beams shynynge mooste clere in to the house, and gyues lyght to all that ar within: whiche wylfully dothe shute the wyndous, & shute the sone beames, by reason wher of, he is left darke in ye hous.³

As Edgeworth's audience in Bristol was more popular than Longland's at Court, we should expect to find in his preaching a less formal, more colloquial manner, and indeed there is not that rhetorical elaboration which characterizes the bishop's method. When expounding Scripture he does not use question and answer, but rather simply and vigorously expands the literal sense, as (of Luke vi. 25):

Ve qui saturati estis, quia esurietis. Wo be to you that be farced stuffed, and full fed, for you shal be a hungred at your iudgement, when ye shall beg refreshing, and none shalbe giuen you. . . .⁴

Frequently his racy colloquialism reminds us of Latimer, as in this pungent passage on Our Lord's patience:

When he was rayled agaynste, and called heretike and traytoure, a benche-whystler, a blowboll, a felowe with ribalds, knaues, whores, and drabbes, all this wynde shoke no corne, all this moued hym not, but euer styll he proceded in his godlye purpose and for yl wordes gaue to them agayn blessed wordes of godlye exhortation, and good counsayle.⁵

¹ *Sermond at Grenwiche*, 1536, sig. Fi^v. For an earlier parallel to the dust being swept behind the door, cf. G. R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Mediaeval England* (Cambridge, 1933), p. 31.

² *Sermond at Rychemunte*, 1535, sig. Bi^r.

³ *Ibid.*, sig. Hi^r. Only occasionally do Longland's *exempla* seem to be drawn from scenes of contemporary life. A notable exception is the spirited description of a hunt; the clamour, the sounding of the horns, the urging on of the dogs, the rigours willingly borne 'for a negligible prey'. *Quinque Sermones*, f. 82^v.

⁴ *Sermons*, f. 7^r.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 230^v.

Also, he is able to present a dramatic scene, with the very accent of conversation, which Longland never attempts. The following passage on the difference between an image and an idol shows this very clearly:

I woulde you shoulde not ignorauntely confounde and abuse these termes, takyng an Image for an Idolle, and an Idolle for an Image, as I haue hearde manye doe in this cite, as well of the fathers and mothers (that shoulde be wise) as of theyr babies and chyl dren that haue learned foolyshnesse of theyr parentes. Nowe at the dissolucion of Monasteries and of Freers houses many Images haue bene caryed abrod, and gyuen to the children to playe wyth all. And when the children haue them in theyr handes, dauncynge them after their chilydshe maner, commeth the father or mother and saythe: What nasse, what haste thou there? the childe aunswereth (as she is taughte) I haue here myne ydoll, the father laugheth and maketh a gaye game at it. So saithe the mother to an other. Jugge, or Thommye, where haddest thou that pretye Idoll? John our parishe clerke gaue it me, saythe the childe, and for that the clerke must haue thanks, and shall lacke no good chere.¹

Edgeworth too has many *exempla*, but they are fresher and more individual than those of Longland. Thus, he uses the mole as an emblem of self-centred worldly wisdom, but gives a personal twist to his presentation:

One of these three noughtie wisdomes S. James calleth earthlye wisdom, and that is it that couetous men be combed with all, whych be euer like wantes or Moles moiling in the grounde, and when they shuld ascend aboue such worldlines to godly meditations, as to here sermons or diuine seruice, they be as blinde as the Molle. Either they cannot perceiue any thing of godly or heauenly counsail, or if they perceiue it, yet they haue no swetenes in it, but down they would headlong to their lucre and aduauntages againe, like as a Molle if a man would feede her with wine and wastel, she will none thereof, but downe againe to the grounde she will, and there she is more strong then a Lion, and after her maner wiser then anye other beast.²

Frequently he appeals to the experience of his audience, to the farmers, fishermen, merchants, and sailors to be found amongst it, as in this passage on the need for a preacher to continue his labours, even if (as too often happens) he seems to have but little effect:

The third profit, although I haue not perswaded men todaye, yet to morowe I maye peraduenture, and if not to morow, I may the next day after, or the fourth day, or in tyme to come. Example we may take of a Fisher and the fish that longe nibbleth at his bayte, yet at the last he is taken and cast on lond. Likewise a husbandman, if he wold giue of going to ploughe, because he seeth distem-

¹ *Sermons*, f. 40^r. On the defence of images by another Catholic preacher of this period cf. the anonymous sermon in MS. Bodley 119, with its interesting pictorial details of the old images themselves; St. Paul with his sword and book, St. Lawrence with his gridiron, St. Catherine with her wheel, St. Andrew with his cross.

² *Ibid.*, f. 6^r.

perauunce and troublous weather many times, and looseth hys labour and cost, we shoulde all dye for hunger. Lykewise the shypman or the marchaunt, if for one storme or twayne, or one losse or twayne, he should abhorre and giue of goyng to the sea, there would at the last no man auenture to the seas, and then farewell this citey of Bristowe, and all good trade of marchaundyse and occupying by sea. The husbandman often laboreth and breaketh one peece of grounde, and litle or nothing gayneth, yet at last recouereth in one yeere the losse of many yeres afore. And the Marchaunt man although he hath had losse by shipwracke diuers times, yet he abstaineth not to passe and seke out straunge portes, and manye times auentureth on hys olde busynes with a Cabao, gathered of borrowed money, and dothe full well, and cometh to great substaunce and riches.¹

Edgeworth's most deeply felt and personal images are drawn from farming and gardening; these show a real sympathy for growing things and animals. In the early sixteenth century it was of course possible, because of the predominantly agricultural state of the country, for even a highly learned man like Edgeworth to have considerable farming lore. This comes out very clearly in the following treatment of the 'passions':

They be *obertas quedam animorum*, a certaine batilnes or frutfulnes of ye soul which shuld not be destroyed, but rather wel husbanded & bated, as if a ground or a garden be to ranke, it is not best clene to destroy yt. ranknes, but rather to bate it with sand or grauel, or such like, or els the herbes the graffes and trees that be there set, wil canker and be nought. So it is of these iiii affections after these Philosophers that they must not be cleane destroyed but moderate and kept subject to reason. . . .²

Similarly clear is the sympathy in this delightful image expressing the necessity for preachers to give their flocks sound doctrine:

They muste wyth discrete solicitude and studie provide such pasture and feedinge for them, as shall be good and holsome, & not driuing them to ranke feeding that wil bane them: to corrupte ground, as to a certayne spire white grasse, that growith in some grounde, or to groundes that be morish, maresh or otherwise vnholosome, & like to coothe the flocke, for suche the flocke desyreth. And yf they be let run at ther own liberte, to suche feedinge they wyll drawe, rather then to holsome pasture.³

Longland, on the other hand, when he does use examples from gardening, is quite bookish and conventional, as in his comparison of Scripture to a garden with various flowers and medicinal herbs, in the exordium to his series on the Penitential Psalms; an illustration drawn not from his own experience but from a well-known image of St. John Chrysostom.⁴ He

¹ Ibid., f. 13^v.

² Ibid., f. 56^r.

³ Ibid., f. 295^v. Cf. too the figure of the plough made to shine by use, f. 172^r, almost an anticipation of Hopkins's 'sheer plod makes plough down sillion shine'.

⁴ In the first Homily on the Statues, Migne, *Patrologia Graeco-Latina*, xlix. 17. Cf. *Sermones*, f. 1^r.

does seem to have an affection for flowers as tokens of the handiwork of a benevolent creator, but his flower-lists owe something at least to St. Jerome's commentary on *Considerate lilia agri*.¹

That it was necessary in his day to defend the use of *exempla* and narrations in preaching, against the Protestant-minded, is shown by Edgeworth's interesting polemic:

I reade a narration of two crafts menne. But yet because (I heare) that some younge menne be daungerous and will peradventure contemne or dispise such narrations as wel as some other thinges whiche they canne not amende, somewhat to comforte them that woulde heare examples for theyr learnynge, you shall note what the Apostle saith. Ephe. iiii *Omnis sermo malus ex ore vestro non procedat sed si quis bonus ad edificationem fidei vt det gratiam audientibus*. Let no yll speache or talkinge passe out of your mouthe, but if you haue anye good talkinge to edifie and healepe our fayeth that it maye geue a grace to the audience. Sainte Ambrose expoundinge the same wordes saieth *Bonae enim & sobrie fabule dant gratum exemplum audientibus*. Good & sober tales geueth pleasant examples to the hearers. Sober tales (he saith) suche as be neither wilde nother wanton. But suche as a manne maye take good and pleasant examples of, as Esopes fables and such other. . . . A feete or proper tale is no more but a mery wrappynge in or coueryng of some truth inuented and sette foorth for mennes profite, and for their plesure to allure them better to remember the matter that is spoken of.²

Like Longland, however, Edgeworth is sparing of narrations,³ nor does he give personal reminiscences in the manner of Latimer.

III

When we turn our attention to the characteristic themes of these two preachers, we find crystallized for our inspection the dominant religious spirit and moral outlook of the Catholic party on the eve of its fall from power. What then is the most characteristic note of the sermons? Significantly, it is the lament over the transience of earthly things, and an admonition as to the vanity of trusting in them. The most deeply felt and imaginatively eloquent passages in both preachers are variations on the *Ubi sunt* theme;⁴ in Longland characteristically rhetorical, yet of great emotive force; in Edgeworth simpler in manner, but having a poetic beauty hard to rival in early-sixteenth-century prose. From Longland, among an embarrassingly large number of instances, the following may be taken as typical: having quoted St. John, 'The world passes', he continues:

¹ 'Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel', Migne, *P.L.*, xxvi. 45.

² *Sermons*, f. 61^v.

³ An exception is the story of Edgeworth's patron St. Cuthbert, entertaining 'a poore wayfarynge man' who turns out to be an angel. *Sermons*, f. 261^r.

⁴ A contemporary poem like Skelton's *On the Death of the Noble Prince King Edward the Fourth* is of course a versification of this central preaching theme.

And he that settis mooste by hit, shall percaase sunnyst goo frome hit, sunnyst wax wery of hit. Wery of eatynge & drynkynge, wery of sporte & play, wery of daunsynge, syngynge and long lyyng a bede, wery of huntyng & hawkinge & other lyyke tryfullynges. And yet we make asmuche of hit, as thoughe hit shuld neuer ende, as thoughe we shulde neuer dye. And yet we dye, we dye and passe away with the worlde, and with his concupiscensys and figure. *Ecce morimur* (saythe Scripture) & *quasi aqua dilabimur*. Loo, loo, we dye & slydd forthe as the watur doys. A streme of watur, be hit neuer so styll, yet euer hit runnys, hit runnythe & passithe secretly, and soo secretly that annethe hit kan be perceuyd: and yet hit passithe. Soo we, we slydd away, our lyffe goythe frome vs, our yerys passithe, our infancy is waastyd, our childehode is spente, our adolescence is goon, our youghe is past, our age shall a way, and we shall a way wt. itt. We waaste and deokay, we wex more feble euery daye then other, and yet wyll not we be a knowen ther of. For many oon doothe say, euyn when they ar veray agyd, myn yye sighth is as good as euer hit was, I am as stronge and as lustye as euer I was, I can caste the barre as fare as euer I kowde, & drawe as stronge a bowe, and shoote as farre, rryd, goo and runne as lustely as euer I dyde: and wyll not be a knowne of ther oun debilitie, nor howe they deokay in nature, lytill and lytill, thoughe hit be skarcely perceptible: and yet at lengthe hit is perceuyed, at lengthe hit is openly knowen.¹

Then, showing that five of the ages of the world are past, and that men are now living precariously in the sixth and last, Longland concludes:

And Christe dydd, Potor is paste, the apostilis ar goon. The grette emperours Iulius Cesar, Octauianus Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero, Vaspasianus, Titus, Domicianus, Traianus, And all ye other tyll nowe our tyme, they all ar paste and goon. And all nowe lytyll memory of them. Who remembrithe nowe William the conqueroure of Englund? who saythe oons, god haue mercy oon his soule? Wher is kynge Arthure, Where is Godfray of Boleyn & the IX Wurthyys? And of this age is paste MCCCCXXXV yeres: and howe longe hit shall endure, god oonly knowys.²

If we set beside this a passage from Edgeworth on the same theme, we notice the lack of elaborate rhetorical pattern, but in place of this he offers an individual treatment with vivid pictorial effect; this extract is surely one of the most beautiful in early Tudor prose: after quoting St. Peter on the Christians' hope of entering heaven 'Into an inheritance that is incorruptible, vndefowled, and neuer fadyng', he continues:

The inheritauce of Heauen, (as the Apostle saythe here) hath three excellent properties, whyche wee maye ymagine by three contrarye properties, whyche no purchaser wyll haue in anye Patrimonie, manour, or Lordshippe that he shoulde bye or purchase for himselfe to inhabite or dwell in. Firste if it be a rotten

¹ *Sermond at Rychemunte*, 1535, sig. Diii^v.

² *Ibid.*, sig. Ei^r. Cf. too the sustained lament in *Sermones*, f. 394^r.

grounde where all thyng anone mouleth, the tenautes, and mortises of tymber buyldynge rotteth oute and loseth their pynnes. The walles or rouffes gathereth a mosse or a wyld Fearne, that rotteth out the Lyme and Morter from the stones. And where the Sea or fresh water weareth out the ground: so that all things that there is, in shorte space commeth to nought. Hee is not wyse that wyll bestowe hym selfe or hys money on suche a grounde. Second if there bee in the Lande or House any infectyue or pestylent Ayre, disposynge menne to manye infirmities, and genderynge adders, snakes, or todes, or these stingyng scowts or gnats, that will not suffre men to slepe, a man shoulde haue litle ioye to dwell in such a manour. Third, if it be suche a grounde where al thinge withereth, and dryeth awaye for lacke of moysture, where hearbes proueth not, and trees groweth not to theyr naturall quantitie, where the leues waxeth yelow and falleth at Lammas tyde, where men soweth a bushel and reapeth a peck, and for redde wheate reapeth like rye or otes, that is bestowed on suche a purchase, is but caste awaye. The inheritaunce of thes transitorye worlde hath all these noughty properties rehearsed, and manye worse, townes and towres, castels and manours decayeth continuallye, and where noble men haue dwelled, nowe dwelleth dawes and crows, the vawtes and rouffes be so ruinous, that no man dare well come vnder them. Where is Troye? where be the olde Emperies and monarchies of the Assirians, of the Caldeis, Medes, Persies, and of Rome, whose Emperours had vnder them in maner all the worlde, for theyr tyme? . . . All thinge waxeth olde and decayeth in processe of time, so that corruption and deathe is the ende.¹

Both preachers, in the tradition of the Middle Ages, take a sad view of human life; its vanities, its besetting temptations, its pains and sorrows visibly increasing in these latter evil days: as Edgeworth pessimistically declaims:

. . . how frequent and many infirmities raigneth: we see dayly infections of pestilence, pockes great and small, & these newe burninge agues, and innumerable others, more then the Phisicians haue written of in their bookes. These contaminate and defowleth mens bodies by infections, aches and paines euen to death. And what corruption and infection of maners commeth to the soule, by euill examples, ill wordes, and suche other occasions, it were to long to be spoken of nowe. Thirde, the comon sterilitie and barrenes of the grounde, the greates scarsitie of all maner of vitall and of fruited of the earth, we feele it so many times to our great paine and discomfort, that it nede not to be declared.²

Longland at times exhibits a dark hatred of the body *per se*: "This bodye is the greatest enemye that man hath, and sonest dothe brynge man vnto dampnacion";³ the senses, by our persistent misuse of them, become regarded merely as gates leading to sin:

We turn our eyes to vile and vain sights, through multifarious occasions to sin. We often use our ears to listen to detractions and empty words. We catch with

¹ *Sermons*, f. 120^r.

² *Ibid.*, f. 121^r.

³ *Sermonde at Grenewiche*, 1538, sig. Diii^r.

our nostrils scents, aromatic odours, the fragrance of wines, and perfumes of balsam. For our mouth we prepare sumptuous food, seasoned with various spices. The tongue utters the greatest wickedness, it sows discords and quarrels between friends.¹

The bishop in his zeal that all should adopt a detached attitude to the world, with its alluring 'siren voices',² at times shows a jealousy of the vigour and gaiety of youth, which he constantly regards as a time of mere vanity, and filthy servitude to the body:

Who are they that are greued, burdened, weryed & fynde faulte with this bodye? the iolye huffaas and ruffelers of this worlde? The yonge galandes of the courte? The lusty Iuuentus youthe? Noo, noo, noo. None of these. For there is nothyng in thys worlde more pleasaunte, more acceptable to them than the bodye. For all there study is how to please this bodye, how to take the ease of this bodye, the pleasure of this bodye. Euery waye sekynge and inuentyng how to follow the voluptye and carnall desires of this bodye. We se howe they studye to set forthe this bodye, to fashion it, to make it appeare more gorgyous, more syghtlye & better in makynge and shape then God made it. Nowe with this fashion of apparell, now with that. Nowe with this cutte, and that garde. . . .³

However, such wicked service of the body can last only for a little while; there is almost vindictive rejoicing over the ultimate fate of beauty and strength:

This fayre bodye of thyn yt. yu makeste somoche of, yt. yu dekkest so preciously, yt. yu settest somoche by, itt shall awaye, itt is butt *terra & cinis, puluis & esca vermium*. It is but earthe, ashes, duste & wormes meate. *Serpentes hereditabunt illud*. Serpentes shall enheryte thy bodye as thou doest naturally thy fadre his landes. Euen so serpentes wormes and toodes shall gnawe, eate and deuoure thy beawtyfull face, thy fayre nose, thy clere eyes, thy whyte handes, thy gudly bodye.⁴

If youth is sensual and forgetful, age is tortured by physical miseries; 'then because of the infirmity of the feet and arms a staff is needed, then man loses his teeth, the stomach becomes weak, the eyes dim, the ears become deaf, the head grows white and shaky: the tongue stammers, the courage and vigour of youth slips away; every part of the body testifies weakness';⁵ but alas! wisdom does not come—rather we find wrath and covetousness:

And although the proverb says of the aged, *bis pueri senes*, nevertheless in this one thing they are quite different, that whereas young children easily forgive and condone injuries: old people, on the contrary, are found to be extremely unforgiving, so full are they of anger, and a certain senile malice.⁶

¹ *Sermones*, f. 150^v.

² *Ibid.*, f. 4^v.

³ *Sermones at Grenewiche*, 1538, sig. Dii^v.

⁴ *Sermones at Grenewiche*, 1536, sig. Eii^v. Cf. also *Sermones*, ff. 32^v, 398^r.

⁵ *Quinque Sermones*, f. 56^v.

⁶ *Sermones*, f. 704^r.

But inevitably, to all comes death, terrible to the sinner; the sure signs appear, the changing colour and expression of the face, the darkening eyes, the loss of hearing and difficulty of speech,¹ and after death, the dread Judgement. Those who escape Hell with its exulting and horrible demons² have before them an excruciating Purgatory, treated by Longland almost as a second Hell with little mention of the aspects of purification, hope, and even joy in suffering stressed by the best Catholic writers, as St. Catherine of Genoa; on the contrary, the souls there suffering 'pain' and 'loss' cry out piteously to the living for a suffrage of prayers, satisfactory works, and masses, so that their torments may be shortened.³

The themes of moral complaint which bulk large in both preachers are largely traditional,⁴ but they are presented with a literary skill and effectiveness not found in vernacular English sermons before the sixteenth century. Thus both agree that the preacher himself is all too little heeded; Longland with characteristic severity declaims:

For we, to whom has been assigned by God the lot of preaching the Gospel, are observed to have performed our function, whenever we show how detestable are the perils of sin, tell of the infestations of demons, the punishments of Hell, and the mansions of Heaven. Also, we set forth those things which are necessary for the soul's health; how great a store of merit follows upon good works, and what great evils malefactors deserve. But how few, I ask, are there who heed our counsels and exhortations? What result follows from so many sermons? How very few do you find made better? How few who wish to amend their lives in accordance with our preaching? Who takes the trouble to alter his corrupt life? And this is what we should expect, for men are none other than cruel, voluptuous, unteachable, rebellious, of hard and intractable heart, not fearing God, nor living according to his word, but wholly negligent of themselves, and the care of their souls.⁵

Edgeworth too has no illusions about the effect of his exhortations: he testifies to the smouldering hostility sometimes found among the audience, which they are not afraid to express openly in the tavern:

When you be on your Ale benche or in your bankets at the whot and strong wine, you spot your owne soules and spotteth others by your euill tonges and yll examples, teachinge youthe to be as euill as you bee. Then haue at the preachers, then they hurte men with their rayling tongues, and more hurt they woulde do with their handes if it were not for feare of the kinges lawes. You hadde nede to amend this maner, you must be content to heare your fauts tolde you, that you maie so amend them, for feare lest the deuill leade you still in your affectate and blinde ignoraunce, till he haue brought you to the blinde exterior darkenes in hell, where he woulde haue you.⁶

¹ *Quinque Sermones*, f. 88^r.

² *Sermones*, f. 4^r.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 6^v.

⁴ Cf. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, chs. v-vii, The Preaching of Satire and Complaint.

⁵ *Sermones*, f. 61^r. Cf. Bishop Brunton's earlier complaint on this topic, Owst, *Preaching in Mediaeval England*, pp. 19-20.

⁶ *Sermons*, f. 218^v.

Nevertheless, he is convinced that preachers must continue to labour diligently and unselfishly, even if there is little apparent effect: let them carry on:

For we se by experience that the veynes of waters floweth and runneth, although no manne come to water his cattell at them: and welles although no manne drawe up water at them, yet they sprinkleth, boileth and wellet up. And brookes, although neither man nor beaste drinke of them, yet neuer the lesse they keepe their course and floweth. So he that preacheth must lette his veyne of sapience flow and runne among his audience, although no man drinck of it, take hede unto it, or receiue it.¹

In one delightful passage Edgeworth appeals to the better nature of his audience, using his favourite farming imagery; let the hearers listen to the preachers' words and live as they exhort them:

That they maie be glad of their labours taking among you, like as a husband-man which is glad to do his work when he seeth the trees of his setting & grafting prove well, & bear fruites, when he seeth the fields of his tillynge beare plentifullye suche Corne or grayne as hee hath sene, then he perceiueth that he hath not laboured in vayne, bende his backe, and galled his handes in vayne, and that he hath not without some cause suffered and borne the heate of Somer, and the colde of Winter: he is gladd of his paines taking, this shal make him glad and merie so to do another time.²

Women, with their taste for cosmetics and their wanton ways, so much decried by the medieval preachers, arouse Edgeworth's stern disapproval:

Because Saint Peter hadde bidde al wiues please ther husbandes with obedience and due subiection, lest they shoulde thinke thys subiection and pleasyng of their husbandes to stande in trimmyng and dressyng their bodies curiously and wantonlye for their husbandes pleasures, he declareth that he meaneth nothing lesse, & biddeth theim that they vse not to make ther heere for the nonce, setting it abrode smoothly stickt, to make it shine in mens eyes or curiously platted in traces, or as gentlewomen vse nowadaies purposly neglected, hanging about their eies, as it were sayyng: I care not how my heere lye, and yet while they do so, when they take vpon them to care least then they care most for their heere. Some there be that can not be contente with their heere as God made it, but dothe painte it and set it in another hue, as when it was white hoore, they dye it fayre and yelow or if it be blacke as a crowe, it muste be set in some lighter colour, as browne, or aburne or redde: And so muste ther browes and the bryes of ther eye lyddes be painted proporcionably.³

¹ Ibid., f. 12^v.

² Ibid., f. 298^r.

³ Ibid., f. 198^r. Later in this sermon women are told not to dispute with God's handiwork; the conclusion of the matter is: "Therefore in yt. thou thinkest thyselfe that thou arte made fayrer, thou art made fowler in dede, beggyng of colours made with poudre of stoness, with rindes of trees or with ioyce of herbes, the thing that thou haste not of thyselfe." Cf. also *ibid.*, f. 53^r.

The dishonesty of merchants (another stock theme) still deserves rebuke; Edgeworth attributes it to presumption:

Why doth one neighbour deceiue another nowe in this fayre time; by false weightes or measures, by false lyghtes, by false oother? because they feare not God that hath forbid us so to do.¹

Longland is particularly frank on the main evil which he sees rampant in the Church of his day, simony:

Choppynge and chaungynge, byinge & sellynge of benefices and of spirytual gyftes and promocyons. And noo better marchandyse is now a dayes, then to procure vouns of patrons for benefices, for prebendes, for other spirituall lyueloode: whether it be by sute, requeste, by letters, by money, bargayne or otherwayes, yee whether it be to bye them or to sell them thou shalt haue marchandes plentye, marchandes ynoughe for it.

These vouns are abroode here in this cite: In whiche cite? In mooste parte of all the greate cite[s] of this realme. In the shoppes, in the streetes a common marchandyse. And they that do come by theyr benefices or promociions vnder soche maner, shall neuer haue grace of god to profete in the churche.²

Again, the bishop laments, in his Visitation Sermon at Westminster Abbey, the decay in the religious life of his day:

If they have magnificent furnishings, precious ornaments, tables decorated with all the craftsman's skill, laden with sumptuous dishes and exquisite feasts, piled up with second or third relays of courses, even with dessert (in case anything should be lacking): if they strive after coloured trappings for horses, and constantly indulge in fowling, hunting, secular pursuits, irreligious wanderings: if they adopt curiousness and softness of dress, and other things of this sort: are these things not considered the portion of secular lords and worldly men rather than of monks?³

A new theme for complaint appears in Edgeworth; the decay of the universities in the latter part of Henry's reign:

. . . verye pitie moueth me to exhorte you to mercye and pitie on the poore studentes in the vniuersities Oxforde & Cambridge, whiche were neuer fewer in number, & yet they that be lefte, be ready to runne abroad into the world and to leaue their study for very nede. Iniquitie is so aboundaunt that charitie is all colde. A man would haue pitie to heare the lamentable complaintes that I heard lately, being among which wold god I were able to releue. This I shal assure you, that (in my opinion) ye cannot better bestowe your charitie.⁴

¹ *Sermons*, f. 135^v.

² *Sermonde at Grenewiche*, 1538, sig. Fii^r.

³ *Tres Conciones*, sig. Ci^r.

⁴ *Sermons*, f. 54^r. Latimer's complaint on this topic in Edward's reign is well known; cf. *Sermons*, ed. G. E. Corrie (Parker Soc., 1844), pp. 178-9. However, the words of another Catholic preacher, William Chedsey, at St. Paul's Cross in 1544, should be noted: "The vniuersities decaye: Grammer scoles be desolated: The olde trees by reason of age

However, neither Longland nor Edgeworth deals with specific and individual cases of the evils they denounce, as Latimer was to do in Edward's reign (such as his bringing instances of the miscarriage of justice to the king's notice); rather they content themselves with broadly general declamations on the topics which give offence. This of course is largely because of the traditional nature of their complaints, but probably also, what was possible in the way of free speech from the pulpit in Edward's time was hopelessly imprudent in Henry's.

Both preachers defend the Catholic dogmatic position, but significantly there is little real theological argument.¹ Thus Longland in his sermon against Luther is content to join the contemporary heretic's name with those of former centuries, with Arrius, Manicheus, Pelagius, Origen, Jovianian, Helvidius, Nestorius, Donatus, Wyclif, Hus, and others; and to indulge in a tirade of personal denunciation.² Edgeworth indeed defends Ceremonies in an interesting and well-worked-out homily, but more usually he deals in mere debater's points; as that it is foolish not to accept the doctrine of Purgatory because the word does not occur in Scripture, for where do we find the word Trinity?³ Or again the folly of Lutheranism is dismissed by a picture of its ludicrous practical results in Germany; they

... confounde and deface all good order of diuine and humaine thinges, allowing the women to serue the altar, and to say masse while the men tarry at home, and keepe the children and wash theyr ragges and clothes: and aswell they might allow the women to be captains of their warres and to leade and gide an army of men in battel, while theyr husbendes tary at home to mylk the Cowe, and serue the Sow, and to spyne and carde.⁴

Similarly, on the burning question of the vernacular Bible, Edgeworth has little real argument. He would welcome, he declares, an English version

ware away and dy: there is nother slyppes nor graffes newe planted: it is to be feared therefore, that there wyll be no more orchardes: it is to be feared that the fayth wyl away.' *Two notable sermones lately preached at Paules crosse Anno 1544. Overseen and perused by the byshop of London, 1545*, sig. Fii^v (the second sermon is by Cuthbert Scott); copy at Peterborough. Like Latimer, Chedsey also complains vigorously about prostitution in London, and the 'enclosures' in the countryside.

¹ Professor Owst points out: 'On its purely doctrinal side, the English pulpit of the waning Middle Ages has little inspiration to offer' (*Literature and Pulpit*, p. 54); while Philip Hughes (*The Reformation in England*, pp. 97-98) rightly stresses that this theological weakness in English piety was one of the main reasons why the dogmatic revolution was effected with only isolated protest.

² *Tres Conciones*, ff. 41^v-42^r: 'If you commit the works of this one man to the flames, you will kill the whole hydra of heresies, you will subdue with certain victory the beast of many heads. It is your heresy I mean, O Luther, Luther: all we faithful people want your opinion changed, you lying man, you wretched impostor, you most unfaithful minister of God and equally of the whole Christian world! Our desire and wish is to destroy your bundle of most unfaithful opinions with a bundle of wood. ...'

³ *Sermons*, f. 20^v.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 165^v.

to be allowed to those who had sufficient education, and were likely to profit from reading it, but as to the availability of fit translators, 'there is the doubt'.¹ He has no doubt, however, about the bad effects of those current; Bible reading by ignorant laymen is dismissed by a reference to its disorganizing results:

I haue knowen manye in this towne, that studienge diuinitie, hath kylled a merchaunt, and some of other occupations by their busy labours in the scriptures, hath shut up the shoppe windowes, faine to take Sanctuary, or els for mercerye and groserye, hath be[ne] fayne to sell godderds, steanes, and pitchers and suche other trumpery.²

It remains true that the greatest of the old Catholic apologists and controversialists, as far as the popular front was concerned, was a layman, More; little of solid value was offered by the clergy (with the possible exception of William Peryn's sermons on the Blessed Sacrament at St. Paul's Cross in 1545)³ until Mary's reign, with the theological preaching of Bishop Watson,⁴ his set of sermons on the Sacraments, and the Homilies set forth by Bonner.⁵

In conclusion, it must be asked what were the positive values which Longland and Edgeworth offered amongst so much pessimism and denunciation? It should be stressed that although they seldom deal with the happier and more tender aspects of the Christian religion (and this, of course, is a grave criticism of the old Catholic religious temper),⁶ nevertheless when they do so, their words have a power and an appeal which comes partly from the very paucity of such passages, but also from a certain inherent intensity of feeling, that even if most men blindly disregard these values, they are, to those who have understanding, the most precious in the world. Longland is still fired by the monastic and ascetical ideal; this praise of the religious life as it should be lived comes on the very eve of the dissolution of the monasteries:

Happy is your conscience, happy and blessed your virginity, if, on account of the love of Christ (which is wisdom, chastity, obedience, and the other virtues) no other love is admitted into your heart. This love shuts out the love of the world, as one key in a lock keeps out another. You must keep to the chosen path, you must go forward through the scorpions and adders of the world, you must make your journey through the snares and perils of this life with girded loins and

¹ *Sermons*, f. 33^r.

² *Thre . . . godlye Sermons, of the . . . sacrament of the Aulter*. 1545.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 43^v.

⁴ *Twoo notable sermons made before the Quenes highnes*. 1554 (on the Blessed Sacrament). *Holsome and Catholyke doctryne concerninge the Seuen Sacramentes of Chrystes Churche . . . set forth in the maner of shorte sermons to bee made to the people*. 1558.

⁵ *A profitable and necessarye doctryne, with certayne homelies adioyned therunto set forth by the reuerende father in God, Edmonde, byshop of London*. 1555.

⁶ This is fully within the late medieval tradition; cf. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, p. 22.

sandalled feet, grasping your staff in your hands; that, having a pure conscience, you may truly say with the prophet, *Domine dilexi decorum domus tuae, et locum habitationis gloriae tuae. Unam petii a te, hanc requiram, ut inhabitem in domo domini omnibus diebus vitae meae.* Then at length you will be able to reach those sweet streams of the Jordan, to enter into the promised land, and to go up to the house of God.¹

Again, the Catholic Church itself, the Ark of Salvation, kindles the imagination of Longland; against that Divine Society the gates of Hell will never prevail; having spoken of the 'figure' of Solomon's Temple, the bishop proceeds, speaking of the Church:

It is built of living and four-sided stones. Four-sided are those men who are polished by the four cardinal, and the other virtues. They are 'hewn out' who do not leave the faith of the Church because of torments, bruises and oppression: they are regarded as brighter and more sparkling than pearls and every precious stone, because of faith, hope and charity. They shine most radiantly with chastity of body and integrity of spirit. They have not the perishable nature of the cedar, but endure for ever. They are shaped, they are coloured, they are carved by the daily exercise of good works and humble prayer. The temple made with hands fell, the Church which is not made with hands will never fall. The temple has been demolished from the very foundations, the Church can never be destroyed.²

Then, in passages of Grünewald-like intensity, the physical details of the Passion are brought before the eyes of the audience, and that 'fragrant appeal'³ of the love of the Crucified Redeemer is heard with all its persuasiveness in both preachers: in Edgeworth's words:

The crosse layd downe on the grounde extendeth his partes towarde the foure partes of the worlde, East, West, Northe and Southe, and so did the body of Christ when he was nayled on the crosse, lying on the grounde in signe and token that his loue extended to all partes of the worlde, and that for theyr sakes he suffered so great paines as he did. . . . Then consider howe his head was bobbed and beaten and pricked wyth sharpe thornes, his handes & feete bored through and torne with greate nayles. And after that, the crosse, and he hanging on it, hoysed up, & let downe into the mortess made for it, and to be shogged and shaken, hauyng no stay but his own sinowes, fleshe and skynne rent and torne in his handes and feete. Thys was a payne of all paynes, speciallye in that pure complexioned and tender body.⁴

¹ *Tres Conciones*, sig. Eiiii^r.

² *Ibid.*

³ Cf. Owst, *Preaching in Mediaeval England*, p. 348.

⁴ *Sermons*, f. 79^r. Cf. also Longland, *Sermon at Grenwiche*, 1536, sig. Fii^r: 'They crucified hym, they nayled him throughe handes and feete to the crosse. They extended, haalyd and strayned, his blyssyd bodye soo extremely on the crosse that his synous and vaynes crakket: yt. thou moughtyst haue nombred his bones and loyntes.'

The Christian is therefore exhorted to suffer with Christ; Longland urges:

Haue therfore compassion on thy lorde God, and heyre his lamentable complaynte. Shewe pytye upon hym, putt not this heuye crosse to hym ayen to beare, ease him of his heuye burden. Suffre wt. Chryste, beare this crosse wyth hym. Suffre paciently for his sake suche aduersytye as he dothe sende, whedre itt be sycknes or pouertye, myserye or hungre, thyrste, contumelye or shame. whedre itt be rebuke of the worlde, tortures, passions aduersytyes, or other paynes. Suffre, suffre wyth hym. He was an innocent and deserued it not, thou arte a synner and doste deserue itt.¹

Suffering too, Longland points out, has remedial effects if borne willingly; 'the sick man cries out under the hand of the physician, the wounded under the surgeon's hand', but the end is the soul's health; a child weeps in its mother's arms, but 'she washes him, rubs him, anoints him, so that she may have him clean and healthy'.²

Finally, both preachers present the goal of the Christian life, Heaven, the *patria* after the weary pilgrimage through this world, the *via*,³ in passages of great power. It is not easy to win; as Longland puts it, speaking of Christ's death:

Hee entrede the heuens with payne, & thynkest thou to come thydre wyth Ioye and worldly pleasure? *Nemo hic gaudere in mundo, & regnare cum Christo in celo* saithe sainte Ierome . . . Heuen is not wonnen wyth eatinge and drinkinge, with dalyng and playng, with sportinge and hoytinge; but with payne and penaunce, with mysery & pouertye, with aduersitye and tribulacion.⁴

Nor must we, says Edgeworth, think of it in terms of sensual delights:

Carnall, fleshelye, or beastlye in knowedge be they, that of almighty God and heauenlye thinges, imagineth and iudgeth by corporall phantasies, as of God that he is a faire olde man with a white beard, as the painters make him, and that the ioyes of Heauen standeth in eatynge and drinkynge, pipinge and daunsinge.⁵

Men may in these latter days even despise their true home; but Edgeworth beautifully vindicates its joys:

. . . and yet to this daye it is reputed as a wyldernes, or as a thinge forsaken of the most part of people that will not walk in the streyght way that bringeth a man to heauen, but had leauer keepe the brode waye of pleasure, easelye hopping and dauncing to hell, and therefore to them heauen is a wildernes, and also in the wooddes of the wyldernes there be many birdes that singeth swetely, with many and diuers swete tunes: so in heauen where the inhabitauntes shall prayse our Lorde God worlde without ende. There be also in wyldernes many swete and

¹ *Sermond at Grenewiche*, 1536, sig. Giii^r. Cf. also *Sermones*, f. 19^r.

² *Sermones*, f. 22^r.

³ Cf. Edgeworth, *Sermons*, f. 172^r.

⁴ *Sermond at Grenewiche*, 1536, sig. Giii^r.

⁵ *Sermons*, f. 151^v.

pleasant floures, and so in heauen the red roses of Martyrs, the violets of Confessours, the lilies of Virgines. . . .¹

There too the Christian, as Longland puts it, feeds on 'the bread of angels', on God Himself; like the blessed spirits, he is 'held within His vision, satisfied by the possession of Him'.²

¹ Ibid., f. 192^r.

² *Tres Conciones*, f. 25^r.

AMELIA AND THE STATE OF MATRIMONY

By A. R. TOWERS

THE various accidents which befel a very worthy couple after their uniting in the state of matrimony will be the subject of the following history.' Thus Fielding announces at the beginning of his first chapter that *Amelia* is the story of a marriage. *Amelia* is, of course, the story of other things as well,¹ but it is within the context of marriage that the author unfolds his plot and constructs his major episodes. To this plain statement of his subject may be added Fielding's equally plain avowal of a didactic intent: 'The following book', he wrote in his dedication of *Amelia* to Ralph Allen, 'is sincerely designed to promote the cause of virtue, and to expose some of the most glaring evils, as well public as private, which at present infest the country. . . .' Since this claim is not merely conventional but represents a controlling purpose in the composition of *Amelia*, Fielding's story of a marriage warrants investigation as an important part of the 'moral', as well as the 'fable', of his prose epic.

Two of the earliest critical reviews of *Amelia* provide a strong eighteenth-century sanction for emphasizing the marriage story. The first appeared in the *Monthly Review* for December 1751—the month of *Amelia*'s publication—and contained the following statement:

The author takes up his heroine at the very point at which all his predecessors have dropped their capital personages. It has been heretofore a general practice to conduct the lover and his mistress to the doors of matrimony, and there leave them, as if after that ceremony the whole interest of them was at end, and nothing could remain beyond it worthy of exciting or keeping up the curiosity of the reader. Instead of which, Mr. *Fielding*, in defiance of this established custom, has ventured to give the history of two persons already married, but whose adventures, hardships, and distressful situations form a chain of events, in which he has had the art of keeping up the spirit of his narration from falling into that languor and flatness which might be expected from the nature of the subject; for, virtuous and laudable as the tenderness and constancy of a wife to her husband must for ever be considered, these affections are, however, too often esteemed as merely matter of pure duty, and intirely in course; so that he who does not peruse this work, will hardly imagine how the relish of such conjugal endearments, as compose the basis of it, could be quickened enough to become palatable to the reader.

¹ Professor Sherburn—in what remains the most perceptive study of *Amelia*—speaks of Fielding as 'a novelist of many intentions'. He deals chiefly with the epic properties of *Amelia* and with Booth's dual struggle against his own religious doubts and the failure of a corrupt aristocracy to recognize his merits. See George Sherburn, 'Fielding's *Amelia*: An Interpretation', *E.L.H.*, iii (1936), 1-14.

The article contrasts Fielding with the French 'novel-writers, who have given themselves the false air of turning conjugal love into ridicule', and subsequently states that

The chief and capital purport of this work is to inculcate the superiority of virtuous conjugal love to all other joys; to prove that virtue chastens our pleasures, only to augment them; and to exemplify, that the paths of vice, are always those of misery, and that virtue even in distress, is still a happier bargain to its votaries, than vice, attended with all the splendor of fortune.¹

The reviewer was clearly impressed both by the unusualness of the subject and its appositeness to the didactic purpose of the novel. Similarly, the importance of the marriage caught the eye of a Swiss-French journalist (not, to be sure, a 'novel-writer'), Pierre Clément (1707-67), who published in Paris a bi-monthly 'letter' containing current 'nouvelles littéraires'. His letter, dated 'Londres, 1^{er} Janv. 1752', commented as follows:

Dans quelles extrémités se trouvent cette pauvre *Amélie* & son cher mari *Booth*! car elle est mariée . . . , qui plus est, elle aime son mari d'un bout du Roman à l'autre, elle en est aimée passionnément, & c'est de son mariage & de la constance de sa tendresse que viennent tous ses malheurs.²

However striking as the subject for a novel, Fielding's story reflects widespread contemporary attitudes toward marriage and, in general terms, forms part of a literary programme designed to glorify the pleasures of conjugal love. In the background were the moral treatises and domestic conduct books of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, books which expounded (often exhaustively) the various duties of husband and wife. Among them were such works as the immensely popular *The Whole Duty of Man* (1658) by Richard Allestree (?) and *The Ladies Calling* (1673) by the same author; Lord Halifax's *The Lady's New-Years Gift*; or *Advice to a Daughter* (1688); Bishop Fleetwood's *The Relative Duties of Parents and Children, Husbands and Wives, Masters and Servants, Consider'd in Sixteen Sermons* (1705); Steele's compilation from many sources entitled *The Ladies Library* (1714); Defoe's *The Family Instructor* (1715), *Religious Courtship* (1722), and *A Treatise Concerning the Use and Abuse of the Marriage Bed* (1727); and, of course, countless sermons dealing with these topics. Fielding's didacticism on the subject of marriage—whether presented through commentary³ or example—has its basis in the

¹ *Monthly Review*, v (1751), 510-12.

² *Les Cinq Années littéraires*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1755), ii. 202.

³ Fielding, like most eighteenth-century novelists, felt free to comment directly about his story or personages as frequently as he wished. It has been suggested that the relatively new genre of the novel was influenced in this respect by such popular literary forms as the periodical essay, the sermon, and the polite letter. See Irma Z. Sherwood, 'The Novelists as Commentators', in *The Age of Johnson: Essays Presented to Chauncy Brewster Tinker* (New Haven, 1949), pp. 113-25.

more or less homogeneous body of opinion set forth in the conduct books. The ideas are too commonplace to permit more definite identification of their sources.

On a more purely literary level *Amelia* may be considered as part of a growing movement in the eighteenth century to exalt the married state. Steele's essays in the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* had led the way in combating the cynical attitude popularly associated with the Restoration (an attitude held, in all probability, by only a small percentage of the court circle but widely publicized by the drama of the age); as Steele put it,

The wits of this island, for above fifty years past, instead of correcting the vices of the age, have done all they could to inflame them. Marriage has been one of the common topics of ridicule that every stage-scribbler has found his account in; for whenever there is an occasion for a clap, an impertinent jest upon matrimony is sure to raise it. . . . A kind husband has been looked upon as a clown, and a good wife as a domestic animal, unfit for the company or conversation of the *beau monde*.¹

In opposition to this point of view, Steele summed up his programme: 'I have very long entertained an ambition to make the word *wife* the most agreeable and delightful name in nature.'² He was not content merely to praise marriage but tried to show the conditions under which it would flourish or fail, for the married state could be an image of hell as well as of heaven.³ For a happy union, reason and moderation should prevail; the overly amorous and the overly captious both depart from the ideal: 'As Uxander and Viramira wish you all gone, that they may be at freedom for dalliance, Dictamnus and Moria wait your absence, that they may speak their harsh interpretations on each other's words and actions during the time you were with them.' When there is a disposition to be pleased, when a couple are 'good-humoured, affable, discreet, forgiving, patient, and joyful, with respect to each others frailties and perfections', then 'the most indifferent circumstance administers delight' and marriage 'is an endless source of new gratifications'.⁴

Steele's programme is of course related to the great increase in the middle-class reading public and to the infusion of literature with middle-class standards of morality—a process in which Defoe, Addison, and the writers of sentimental comedy had an important part.⁵ The phenomenal success of *Pamela* is to be understood partly in these terms, and it is hardly surprising that Richardson, a complete bourgeois and very much a family man, should write a continuation devoted to the married life of his

¹ *Tatler*, no. 159 (15 April 1710).

² *Spectator*, no. 490 (22 Sept. 1712).

³ *Ibid.*, no. 479 (9 Sept. 1712).

⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 490.

⁵ See A. S. Collins, 'The Growth of the Reading Public during the Eighteenth Century', *R.E.S.*, O.S., II (1926), 284-94, 428-38.

heroine. The rather snobbish desire to depict Pamela in her 'exalted Condition' provided an excellent opportunity for Richardson to expound his views on domestic conduct—the familiar questions of obedience, of the moral duty to nurse one's own baby, of the proper behaviour when one's partner is suspected of infidelity, of the best education for children, of the proper decorum for husband and wife in public.¹ Inasmuch as *Pamela II* preceded *Amelia* by nearly ten years, the article in *Monthly Review* (quoted above) was hardly correct in stating that Fielding 'takes up his heroine at the very point at which all his predecessors have dropped their capital personages'. The reviewer, however, might well be excused for overlooking Richardson's novel in discussing *Amelia*: the former is far more theoretical, artificial, and even affected in posing and 'solving' marital problems. One may compare the bitter realities faced constantly by Booth and Amelia to the following query, posed in all seriousness by Pamela's confidante, Miss Darnford: '... Let me ask you, Mrs. B. Is your Monarch's Conduct to you as *respectful*, I don't mean fond, when you are alone together, as when in Company?'²

Fielding himself had dealt with marriage as a literary subject a number of times before he wrote *Amelia*. In fact, the work closest to *Amelia* in terms of plot is an early play, *The Modern Husband*, written in 1730 but not performed until 1732.³ In it is Mr. Bellamant, a fundamentally good man who, like Booth, has been unfaithful to his wife with Mrs. Modern; this virago combines certain traits of Miss Matthews, Booth's temptress, and Mrs. Trent, a really vicious woman in *Amelia* who commits adultery with a nobleman and subsequently becomes his procuress. Mr. Modern corresponds to Captain Trent—a rascal who turns his wife's infidelity into financial gain. Lord Richly, the paramour of Mrs. Modern, vainly tries to seduce Mrs. Bellamant, but this paragon of wifely virtue not only resists him but also duly forgives her husband for his lapse, just as Amelia successfully wards off her would-be seducers (Colonel James and the unnamed 'noble lord') and forgives Booth for his lapse with Miss Matthews. The relationship between the play and the novel seems closer in outline than it is in actuality. The married life of the Bellamants is merely sketched in, and the Moderns play a much larger part than do the Trents in the novel. Throughout *The Modern Husband* Fielding seems to have been primarily concerned with manipulating his rather complicated plot and

¹ Richardson's earlier interest in the conduct books has been pointed out by Katherine G. Hornbeak in 'Richardson's *Familiar Letters* and the Domestic Conduct Books', *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, xix, no. 2 (1938), 1-50.

² 3rd ed. corrected (London, 1742), iii. 490.

³ See F. Homes Dudden, *Henry Fielding: His Life, Works, and Times* (Oxford, 1952), i. 99-107, ii. 860. Fielding's modern critics, including Cross, Digeon, E. A. Baker, and Dr. Homes Dudden, have all commented upon this similarity.

with satirizing the depravities of London society; there is no attempt to round his characters or to exploit the theme of married love.

Much closer to *Amelia* in spirit is Fielding's poem, 'To a Friend on the Choice of a Wife'. This work—included in the *Miscellanies* of 1743—contains two passages that form an excellent summary of the wifely ideal embodied in *Amelia*:

But thou, whose honest thoughts the choice intend
Of a companion, and a softer friend;
A tender heart, which while thy soul it shares,
Augments thy joys, and lessens all thy cares.
One, who by thee while tenderly caress'd,
Shall steal that god-like transport to thy breast,
The joy to find you make another blest. . . .

May she then prove, who shall thy lot befall,
Beauteous to thee, agreeable to all.
Nor wit nor learning proudly may she boast;
No low-bred girl, nor gay fantastic toast:
Her tender soul good-nature must adorn,
And vice and meanness be alone her scorn.
Fond of thy person, may her bosom glow
With passions thou hast taught her first to know.
A warm partaker of the genial bed,
Thither by fondness, not by lewdness led.
Superior judgment may she own thy lot;
Humbly advise, but contradict thee not.
Thine to all other company prefer;
May all thy troubles find relief from her.
If fortune gives thee such a wife to meet,
Earth cannot make thy blessing more complete.¹

Fielding included another effusion on married love among his contributions to Sarah Fielding's *Familiar Letters between the Principal Characters in David Simple, and Some Others* (1747).² It is in the guise of a letter from one Valentine to his wife Cynthia, and in it the husband, very much in the manner of Steele, deplors the raillery to which marriage is subjected by fashionable people. Valentine relates how he had suddenly felt inclined to make a defence of love before a 'polite' company at Bath. Advancing the idea that to acquire the highest degree of human happiness (perfect

¹ Lines 47-53, 252-67; quoted from *The Complete Works of Henry Fielding, Esq.*, ed. W. E. Henley (London, 1903), xii. 268, 274.

² Letter XLIV. For Henry Fielding's part in the *Familiar Letters*, see Dudden, *op. cit.*, i. 547-51.

happiness being unattainable in this world) is the highest degree of human wisdom, he makes this claim:

Now, in my eye, love appears alone capable of bestowing on us this highest degree of human felicity. I solemnly declare, when I am in passion of my wife, (here was a great laughter) my happiness wants no addition. I think I may aver, it could receive none. I conceive myself then to be the happiest of mankind. I am sure I am as happy as it is possible for me to be.¹

The convention of the 'familiar letter', together with the rhetorical and extravagant tone of Valentine's defence, would not ordinarily inspire confidence in the author's sincerity. It is interesting, none the less, that Fielding should choose the subject of conjugal love for the letter that concludes not only his contribution but his sister's book as a whole.

In the novels preceding *Amelia* Fielding's most extended portrayal of marriage is that of the Heartfrees in *Jonathan Wild*. They are a couple of the most perfect domesticity, relishing simple family pleasures and preferring one another's company to all the allurements of a worldly life. In terms of the novel's sustained irony, Heartfree is a 'silly fellow' and his wife 'a mean-spirited, poor, domestic, low-bred animal, who confined herself mostly to the care of her family, placed her happiness in her husband and her children, followed no expensive fashions or diversions, and indeed rarely went abroad . . .' (II. i). The Heartfrees do not, however, undergo much development as characters, and the threats to their happiness result entirely from external causes and not at all from problems inherent in the marital relationship. Perhaps the closest approach to the 'feel' of *Amelia* occurs when Mrs. Heartfree confronts her children after her husband's arrest:

In the morning the children being brought to her, the eldest asked where dear papa was? at which she could not refrain from bursting into tears. The child, perceiving it, said, 'Don't cry, mamma; I am sure papa would not stay abroad if he could help it.' At these words she caught the child in her arms, and, throwing herself into the chair in an agony of passion, cried out 'No, my child, nor shall all the malice of hell keep us long asunder' (II. ix).²

Joseph Andrews and *Tom Jones* both touch on marriage, but the subject is never of surpassing importance. The happy family life of Mr. Wilson occupies a chapter in the earlier novel (III. iv), and the less idyllic relations of Parson Adams and his wife add an amusing complication to the approaching nuptials of Joseph and Fanny (IV. viii, xi). In *Tom Jones* there are several examples of unhappy marriages. That of the Partridges is dramatized broadly in farcical scenes of violent altercation. That of Captain Blifil and Mrs. Bridget is more quietly and subtly delineated in the chapter

¹ *Works*, ed. W. E. Henley, xvi. 48.

² Cf. *Amelia*, VIII. iii. (In all references to Fielding's novels, the book number is indicated by large roman numerals and the chapter number by small roman numerals.)

called 'A Short Sketch of That Felicity Which Prudent Couples May Extract from Hatred . . .' (II. vii). The Blifils derived their chief satisfaction from tormenting one another:

It was always a sufficient reason to either of them to be obstinate in any opinion that the other had asserted the contrary. If the one proposed any amusement, the other constantly objected to it: they never loved or hated, commended or abused, the same person.

Squire Western, we are told, heartily hated his wife, who was 'a faithful upper-servant' to him throughout their marriage. He saw her only at meals, 'for when he repaired to her bed, he was generally so drunk that he could not see; and in the sporting season he always rose from her before it was light' (VII. iv). A final case is that of Sophia's cousin, Mrs. Fitzpatrick, married to a venal and stupid Irishman. Her special regret was in having married a fool, a man inferior to her in understanding. 'Among my acquaintance, the silliest fellows are the worst husbands; and I will venture to assert, as a fact, that a man of sense rarely behaves very ill to a wife who deserves very well' (XI. vii). None of these instances is really central to the story, but they are further evidence of Fielding's continued interest in the marriage relationship as a subject for didactic commentary—direct or indirect.

Such is the background—in Fielding's earlier work and in the literary practice of the period—for the extensive treatment of marriage in *Amelia*. How is the relationship between Booth and Amelia to be understood? What conclusions did Fielding, in his role as 'moral champion', wish his readers to draw from the experience of this couple? To answer these questions we must isolate several elements of their marriage for detailed examination.

It should be noted, first of all, that the match between Booth and Amelia is one of love, not convenience. Here Fielding was not merely following the long-established conventions of romance; he was also emphasizing a point that accorded fully with the enlightened opinion of his age. Despite the fact that considerations of property carried great weight in eighteenth-century matrimonial arrangements, both the public moralists and the polite essayists frequently stated the need for love (as a 'rational' passion, not a heedless infatuation) as the basis of a happy marriage. Writing in 1673 the author of *The Ladies Calling* insists upon love as the prime requisite of the nuptial vow:

... without this 'tis only a Bargain and Compact, a Tyranny perhaps on the mans part, and a Slavery on the womans. 'Tis Love only that cements the hearts, and where that union is wanting, 'tis but a shadow, a carcass of marriage.¹

¹ Richard Allestree (?), *The Ladies Calling* (Oxford, 1673), pt. ii, pp. 23-24. Steele quotes this passage verbatim (but without acknowledgement) in *The Ladies Library* (London, 1714), ii. 87-88.

Steele, in one of the *Tatler* papers, rhetorically asks the father of 'Sylvia', who for mercenary reasons opposes his daughter's marriage to her beloved 'Philander', 'Whether he can make amends to his daughter by any increase of riches, for the loss of that happiness she proposes to herself in her Philander?'¹ Even the practical Defoe put love first:

Ask the ladies why they marry, they tell you it is for a good settlement, though they had their own fortunes to settle on themselves before. Ask the men why they marry, it is for the money. . . . How little is regarded of that one essential and absolutely necessary part of the composition, called love, without which the matrimonial state is, I think, hardly lawful, I am sure is not rational, and, I think, can never be happy.²

Booth has only an ensign's pay, yet Dr. Harrison, the novel's formidable custodian of morals, does all he can to further the match when he becomes convinced that Booth is an honourable man and does not have designs on Amelia's money (II. iii-iv).

The question of parental consent comes up in connexion with the doctrine that love should be the basis of marriage. Initially Amelia is shown to be completely dependent on her mother's consent; the lovers can hope for nothing until Dr. Harrison has successfully pleaded Booth's cause with Mrs. Harris. Fielding does not question the need for a parent's approval—a subject on which the conduct books were agreed. When Dr. Harrison secretly abets the couple after Mrs. Harris has withdrawn her consent, he does so because he feels that her word, once given, should not be broken and not because he denies her right to give or withhold consent in the first place (II. v). Also present is the implication that no parent has the right to marry a daughter against her will, as Mrs. Harris had tried to do in the case of Amelia and Booth's wealthy rival, Squire Winckworth. Sophia Western in *Tom Jones* had insisted: 'I shall never marry a man I dislike. If I promise my father never to consent to any marriage contrary to his inclinations, I think I may hope he will never force me into that state contrary to my own' (VI. iii).³ Thus, despite the romantic episode of the wine-hamper (by means of which Booth was smuggled into Mrs. Harris's house) and the subsequent flight of the lovers, Fielding does not suggest that there was anything unlawful or even disreputable in the behaviour of Booth and Amelia.⁴

¹ *Tatler*, no. 185 (15 June 1710).

² *A Treatise Concerning the Use and Abuse of the Marriage Bed* . . . (London, 1727); reprinted by Charles Reynell (London, 1841), p. 13.

³ Cf. Defoe, op. cit., p. 47: ' . . . if the parent commands his child to marry such or such a person, and the child either cannot love the person, or at the same time declares he or she is engaged in affection to another, the command of the parent cannot be lawfully obeyed, because it is unlawful for the child to marry any person he or she cannot love. . . .'

⁴ Fielding himself seems to have eloped with his first wife, Charlotte Craddock. See

In illustrating the duty which a wife owes to her husband, *Amelia* combines the accepted standards of domestic conduct with the practical exigencies of life. The obedience of the wife to the husband in all things lawful was, and always had been, considered fundamental to the relationship; as an express command of God it was insisted upon by all the preachers and moralists.¹ The command of obedience did not, however, entail abject slavery; the author of *The Whole Duty of Man* summed up the situation as follows:

But it may here be asked, What if the Husband command something, which though it be not unlawful, is yet very inconvenient and imprudent, must the Wife submit to such a command? To this I answer, That it will be no disobedience in her, but duty, calmly and mildly to shew him the inconveniences thereof, and to perswade him to retract that command; but in case she cannot win him to it by fair intreaties, she must neither try sharp Language, nor yet finally refuse to obey. nothing but the unlawfulness of the command being sufficient warrant for that.²

On the whole *Amelia* behaves quite simply in accordance with this precept of obedience. Sometimes, indeed, she does so at the cost of great personal unhappiness, as when she agrees that Booth's honour requires him to go to Gibraltar with his regiment, despite her approaching (and first) confinement (III. i). There are two instances, however, in which Fielding shows his awareness of the complexities involved in wifely obedience.

The first occurs when the suspicious Booth peremptorily refuses to let his wife accept masquerade tickets from the noble lord who is plotting her seduction. *Amelia*, though surprised, acquiesces, and when the outraged Mrs. Ellison (who has conveyed the tickets and is secretly in his lordship's pay) protests that *Amelia* is enough to spoil the best husband in the universe, she loyally and gravely replies:

'Pardon me, madam, . . . I will not suppose Mr. Booth's inclinations ever can be unreasonable. I am very much obliged to you for the offer you have made me; but I beg you will not mention it any more; for, after what Mr. Booth hath declared, if Ranelagh was a heaven upon earth, I would refuse to go to it' (VI. v).

Thus her action accords completely with the widely acknowledged duty of a wife to support her husband's views on all public occasions. As soon,

Wilbur L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven, 1918), i. 168-9, and Dudden, op. cit., i. 149; the latter account is coloured largely by the fictional episode in *Amelia*.

¹ See, for example, *The Whole Duty of Man* in *The Works of the Learned and Pious Author of the Whole Duty of Man* (London, 1704), pt. i, p. 119; *The Ladies Calling*, pt. ii, p. 33; and William Fleetwood, *The Relative Duties of Parents and Children, Husbands and Wives . . . in Sixteen Sermons* (London, 1705), pp. 165 ff.

² Op. cit., pt. i, p. 120.

however, as Amelia and Booth are alone together, she insists on knowing his reasons for such a strange command and even suggests that he has been treating her like a child. She concludes her request for enlightenment by saying: 'If after all this, you still insist on keeping the secret, I will convince you I am not ignorant of the duty of a wife by my obedience; but I cannot help telling you at the same time you will make me one of the most miserable of women.' Fielding then adds a realistic touch which effectively keeps Amelia's character from soaring too high in its idealism; he has Booth reply: 'That is, . . . in other words, my dear Emily, to say, I will be contented without the secret, but I am resolved to know it, nevertheless.' That Fielding may have had the conduct-book precepts in mind at this point is suggested by Booth's ironic remark when he finally gives way to his wife's request: 'Why, then, . . . I will tell you. And I think I shall then show you that, however well you may know the duty of a wife, I am not always able to behave like a husband' (VI. vi).

Fielding's implication seems to be that a successful marriage cannot be conducted strictly according to the rules; that human nature must constantly be taken into account. Amelia is a woman as well as an ideal wife, and Booth is far more indulgent than a husband is expected to be.

There is a second occasion on which Amelia opposes her will to her husband's. Here the situation is almost the reverse of the first such instance. It occurs when the unsuspecting Booth announces his intention of accepting a post in the West Indies—a post promised to him by the influential Colonel James. It would entail leaving Amelia and the children in England. Amelia, who suspects the Colonel's evil designs upon her but does not dare inform her husband for fear of a duel, will not hear of being separated from Booth. To excuse this seeming disobedience she pleads a higher duty: 'I will do the duty of a wife, and that is, to attend her husband wherever he goes.' Amelia's demeanour on this occasion is perfectly in keeping with the warnings against 'frowardness' set forth in the conduct books—Fielding relates that 'She gave, indeed, a quiet hearing to all he said, and even those parts which most displeased her ears'; nevertheless, 'her resolution remained inflexible, and resisted the force of all his arguments with a steadiness of opposition, which it would have been almost excusable in him to have construed into stubbornness' (IX. iv). Here the device of an impossible dilemma is used to show once again that the rule of obedience, though generally valid, must at times be accommodated to circumstances.

In the other aspects of her duty, Amelia's conduct approaches perfection. As a mother she is much concerned with the moral education of her children, an education based upon a Lockian principle of association:

This admirable woman never let a day pass without instructing her children

in some lesson of religion and morality. By which means she had, in their tender minds, so strongly annexed the ideas of fear and shame to every idea of evil of which they were susceptible, that it must require great pains and length of habit to separate them (IV. iii).

She lavishes affection upon the children but is never in danger of spoiling them. As a housewife she is both conscientious and cheerful; Booth on one occasion finds her 'performing the office of a cook, with as much pleasure as a fine lady generally enjoys in dressing herself out for a ball' (VI. ii). In her dress she is frugal, but at the same time extremely neat (IV. iv)—the opposite of Colonel James's extravagant wife and of those ladies whom Steele delighted to satirize. As a hostess she conducts herself with perfect decorum but without affectation (IV. iv). She is a model of married chastity who rigorously discourages the least attempt at flirtation; when accused of prudery by her indiscreet friend Mrs. Atkinson, Amelia replies sharply: 'I do not know what you mean by prudery. . . . I shall never be ashamed of the strictest regard to decency, to reputation, and to that honour in which the dearest of all human creatures hath his share' (X. viii).¹ With regard to the most intimate relationship, Amelia is

A warm partaker of the genial bed,
Thither by fondness, not by lewdness led.²

Above all, she represents fidelity in the widest sense. Amelia stands by Booth as a true helpmeet, faithful to his interests, charitable toward his shortcomings. Steele's description of the husband in a happy match applies to Booth again and again as Fielding presents him in the novel:

The married man can say, 'If I am unacceptable to all the world beside, there is one, whom I entirely love, that will receive me with joy and transport, and think herself obliged to double her kindness and caresses of me from the gloom with which she sees me overcast. I need not dissemble the sorrow of my heart to be agreeable there, that very sorrow quickens her affection.'³

Only once does Amelia falter in her loyalty to Booth; it is at the very nadir of their fortunes when Booth has been arrested for the final time and Amelia, thanks to a letter from Colonel James, believes that her husband is deceiving her again with Miss Matthews. In her agony she cries out to her little boy's question about his father: 'Mention him no more,

¹ *The Ladies Calling*, pt. ii, p. 35, admonishes wives 'to abstain even from all appearance of evil, and provide that themselves be (what *Cesar* is said to have requir'd of his wife) not only without guilt, but without scandal also'.

² *To a Friend on the Choice of a Wife*, lines 260-1. The sentence in the revised text of *Amelia* (1762) which reads 'At length they retired, happy in each other' (IV. vi), appeared as follows in the first edition (1751): 'At length they retired, and with mutual Desires, and equal Warmth, flew into each other's Arms.'

³ *Spectator*, no. 490 (22 Sept. 1712).

... your papa is—indeed he is a wicked man—he cares not for any*of us' (XI. ix). At this point a penitent letter arrives from Booth and events change for the better.

Fielding especially emphasizes the need for confidence and mutual trust in a marriage. Much of Booth's misery could have been avoided if he had promptly confessed his original transgression with Miss Matthews; indeed, his fear that she might discover his adultery precipitates the final disaster mentioned above. Only after he has repented and confessed his sin to Amelia is Booth spiritually prepared for the religious conversion that seals his reformation (XII. ii-v). The tragedy brought about by a failure to confide is dramatized most keenly in the chapter entitled 'Read, gamester, and observe'. Here Booth, ashamed to admit the extent of his gambling losses, makes himself and his wife totally wretched by accusing her, with a passion engendered by his own guilt, of not dealing openly with him.

At the heart of Fielding's treatment of marriage is the question of adultery. Its importance is indicated by the fact that Booth's transgression with Miss Matthews while in prison provides, through its consequences, the main complications of the plot. The attempts of the noble lord and Colonel James are the most flagrantly immoral activities in the novel. In their deliberate scheming they are far more to be condemned than is Booth for his single impulsive action; for this point of view Fielding may well have had in mind a passage from his own collection of popular sermons:

Nay, a scheme of adultery coolly weighed and approved of, tho' not executed, may be more criminal, and argue a more inveterate and dangerous state of depravity, with respect to the wicked projector, than the offence itself (absolutely inexcusable as it is in all circumstances) when not premeditated but occasioned by sudden and unexpected temptations.¹

Although the moralists regularly deplore and castigate adultery on the husband's part, there is a noticeable difference in the tone with which they discuss the same crime in a woman. The double standard underlying the popular attitude toward pre-marital lapses from chastity (exemplified in *Tom Jones*) extended, in a diminished degree, to the married state: one can hardly imagine that Fielding, or any other writer, would adduce such excuses or extenuating circumstances for a heroine as he does in behalf of Booth (IV. i). The question of a wife's proper reaction to her husband's infidelity also reflects this double standard. She was cautioned against raging or storming or even taking much notice of the lapse:

A Wise Dissimulation, or very calm notice is sure the likeliest means of

¹ James Foster, *Sermons on the Following Subjects*, 4 vols. (London, 1744); Sermon XVI, 'On the Seventh Commandment', iii. 405-6. Fielding owned a set of Foster's sermons; see the sale catalogue of Fielding's library reprinted in E. M. Thornbury, *Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic* (Madison, 1931), p. 179.

reclaiming, for where men have not wholly put off humanity, there is native compassion for a meek sufferer. We have naturally some regret to see a Lamb under the knife; whereas the impatient roaring of a swine diverts our pity; so that Patience in this case is as much the interest as duty of a Wife.¹

Amelia, in her silent forgiveness of Booth's sin, is shown to be wise as well as charitable.

Throughout the novel Booth constantly poses the problems of marriage while Amelia just as regularly provides the solutions—sometimes, it must be granted, with the aid and advice of Dr. Harrison. Booth's duty as a soldier, his indebtedness, his gambling, his infidelity, his wavering religious faith, his impetuosity—all of these provoke wifely responses of one sort or another in Amelia. These responses are always in terms of the conventional but enlightened opinion of the age; taken together, they form a picture of idealized conjugal behaviour.

Fielding heightens this picture by contrasting the behaviour of the Booths with that of other married couples in the novel. Colonel James and his lady are the most conspicuous 'bad examples'. The Colonel is a hardened libertine, indifferent to his wife and unabashed in his amours. Mrs. James is a superficial worldling who compensates for the hollowness of her marriage by extravagance in dress and an almost feverish pursuit of fashionable diversions. Their union is merely one of convenience; their quarrelsome, spiteful, and thoroughly cynical relationship is depicted with some of Fielding's most effective irony in the chapter entitled 'Containing a very polite scene' (XI. i). On a lower social level and even further advanced in depravity are the Trents, by whom adultery is not only accepted but even converted into a source of livelihood.

The contrast between these couples and the Booths is one of extremes; more closely related to the latter are Sergeant and Mrs. Atkinson. Both are fundamentally good people, and their divergences from perfect marital conduct always remain within the sphere of the 'normal'. In her earlier marriage Mrs. Atkinson (or more properly, Mrs. Bennet) was an example of fatal imprudence. Unlike Amelia she did not preserve the appearance of perfect chastity and, though innocent at heart, allowed herself to be caught in a situation from which tragedy resulted. Later in the story she again compromises her reputation and perhaps her honour to secure her second husband's advancement in the army; this action causes a serious rupture with the Booths and nearly brings about the death of the poor sergeant. Mrs. Atkinson, unlike the simply educated Amelia,² is a formid-

¹ *The Ladies Calling*, pt. ii, p. 27; this identical passage is quoted in *The Ladies Library*, ii. 91.

² Amelia's reading 'was confined to English plays and poetry; besides which, I think she had conversed only with the divinity of the great and learned Dr. Barrow, and with the histories of the excellent Bishop Burnet' (VI. vii).

able bluestocking who spouts forth torrents of Latin and Greek (not always correctly). As it bears on marriage, her excessive learning leads to an unwifely condescension toward her humble husband and to a reversal of the accepted order of supremacy. Atkinson's character is attractive in its gentleness, but as a husband he is overly indulgent and therefore partly to blame for his wife's more serious failings. On one occasion his only means of quieting her anger is by a timely recourse to the matrimonial bed; on another occasion he unmanfully falls on his knees before her in a vain attempt at peacemaking (X. iv; X. viii). Thus, by comparison with the Atkinsons as well as with the Jameses and the Trents, Amelia shines more brightly as the ideal wife and Booth takes on stature as a potentially worthy husband.¹

¹ This article has purposely avoided the vexed question of autobiographical elements in *Amelia*. Lady Orrery, Samuel Richardson, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and her daughter, Lady Bute, all asserted that *Amelia* was based upon Fielding's own history, but their testimony is, for varying reasons, of dubious value. There are indeed certain parallels between the events in the novel and the events in the author's life—the elopement, for example, has already been cited (see p. 151, n. 4 above). For the most part, however, Fielding's recent biographers have had to rely upon *Amelia* to supplement the meagre facts known about his marriage.

In *Amelia* Fielding unquestionably utilized his experience and observations as a magistrate; we can assume that he made similar use of his experiences as a husband in a realistic 'history' of a young married couple, but we cannot, for lack of evidence, know the extent to which he did so.

As far as this article is concerned, it seems likely enough that Fielding, whatever the actual events of his life, would tend to *formulate* his experience in terms of the accepted attitudes of his day. Furthermore, since in *Amelia* he was (in addition to telling a story) clearly presenting an image of marriage for didactic purposes, Fielding, who was no revolutionary, would probably seek to base his ideal upon the best and most widely approved authorities on marital conduct. Certainly Fielding's picture illustrates their principles again and again.

For detailed discussions of the autobiographical question, see Cross, *op. cit.*, i. 169-70, and ii. 328-34; and Dudden, *op. cit.*, i. 148-54, and ii. 855-9.

THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE

By GEOFFREY CARNALL

RICHARD PHILLIPS published the *Monthly Magazine* for over twenty-eight years, from 1796 to 1824. It is a miscellaneous journal which has considerable interest for the student of literature.¹ It is, of course, well known that the *Ancient Mariner* was originally conceived as a contribution to this journal; and among those who wrote for the *Monthly* were Malthus, Godwin, Hazlitt, and Southey. The magazine's interest, however, does not primarily depend on the occasional articles in it by celebrated writers. It comes rather from the light that it throws on the outlook and interests of one section of the reading public in England during the lifetime of John Keats. For the *Monthly Magazine* was the journal of the Dissenters, the Unitarians—radicals in religion and politics alike, believers in the March of Intellect towards the Reign of Mind.

It was started in February 1796 with a twofold purpose:

The first was, that of laying before the Public, through its means, various objects of information and discussion, both amusing and instructive, which have not usually made a part of the contents of similar Publications; or, at least, which have not appeared in them with those advantages which they might derive from superior knowledge, and literary talents.²

The second object was the propagation of liberal principles. The *Monthly Magazine* was an enterprise on behalf of intellectual liberty against the forces of panic conservatism. Its anti-ministerial politics and devotion to free inquiry assured the magazine a steady sale among the Dissenters. (Southey used to call it 'the Dissenters' Obituary'.) A wider public was ready to appreciate its miscellaneous articles on literary, scientific, and political subjects. Inevitably there were those who denounced it as 'a work of dangerous tendency, and deserving the execration of every true patriot'.³ These words occur in the report of a general meeting of subscribers to the Walsall library, who unanimously resolved to discontinue taking the

¹ It has been discussed by Dorothy Coldicutt in *R.E.S.*, xv (1939), 45-60, 'Was Coleridge the Author of the "Enquirer" Series in the *Monthly Magazine*, 1796-9?' Unfortunately Miss Coldicutt's suggestion is clearly mistaken, as Lewis Patton shows in *R.E.S.*, xvi (1940), 188-9. Some useful information about the magazine is given in A. Boyle's articles 'Portraiture in *Lavengro*', published in *N. & Q.* during 1951-2. See especially the first two, on William Taylor and Richard Phillips, *ibid.*, cxcvi (1951), 211-13, 361-6. The sixth, however, on John Thelwall, contains an inaccurate account of the magazine's later history (*ibid.*, cxcvii (1952), 38-39).

² *Monthly Magazine*, i (1796), preface, p. iii.

³ *New Monthly Magazine*, July 1815, p. 539.

Monthly Magazine. The interesting point is that they took it in the first place, honest, patriotic men that they evidently were.

The literary editor (until 1806) was Dr. John Aikin. He was himself one of an able group of Unitarian writers, and was able to secure contributions from them. His father was the founder of the Warrington Academy, a notable centre of Unitarian learning, with which Dr. Priestley and Gilbert Wakefield were associated. One of his most brilliant contributors was another Unitarian, William Taylor of Norwich. He contributed to the magazine regularly from its beginning till 1824. Taylor's biographer notes the extraordinary variety of his contributions, and regrets

that the indefatigability of research and quickness of observation, which were thus diffused in such desultory inquiries, were not concentrated upon one main and absorbing object. It has often been remarked by those who watched his progress, that in his dispersed writings there are talent and learning enough to have built up a score of reputations.¹

Only a comprehensive list of Taylor's contributions can give one any idea of his versatility. They range from the once famous ballad of *Lenore* to philological, philosophical, and historical inquiries. His chief contemporary notoriety arose out of his biblical criticism, specimens of which often appeared in the magazine, though his most extreme heresy—his views on the first two chapters of St. Luke's Gospel—was not expounded there. In October and November 1803 he published two papers arguing that the *Wisdom of Solomon* was written by Jesus of Nazareth. Robert Southey wrote Taylor a very severe letter about this (although he had not in fact read the papers). He upbraided him for undermining the shallow faith of Unitarian pastors. 'We must not give strong meats to weak stomachs', he said.²

The *Monthly Magazine*, however, persisted in giving the strong meat of free inquiry to the supposedly weak stomachs of its readers. One of its most characteristic features was a series of articles entitled 'The Enquirer', which included discussion of such questions as whether Error ought, in any case, to be designedly propagated; whether literary and scientific pursuits were suited to the female character; what degree of improvement could be expected of mankind; and whether uniformity of religion was desirable in a State. Southey himself once thought of considering the question of supernatural warnings and appearances. 'I mean some day', he told Charles Wynn, 'to state the *pro* and *con* in the M. Magazine, and invite controversy, for it has never been fairly and reasonably examined.'³

¹ J. W. Robberds, *A Memoir of the Life and Writings of the late William Taylor of Norwich* (London, 1843), i. 392-3.

² *Ibid.*, i. 459-60. 23 June 1803.

³ *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, ed. J. W. Warter (London, 1856), i. 64. 15 Jan. 1799.

The rest of the magazine included a summary of literary and scientific work in progress (in theory at least, for many of the entries were merely advertisements of forthcoming books); a list of books published in the previous month; political news at home and abroad; marriages, deaths, and other items of provincial news; obituaries (an important feature, as Southey implies); a report of the diseases of London; a commercial and agricultural report; and miscellaneous articles on a bewildering variety of subjects—topography and accounts of tours and journeys being especially popular.

Every six months a supplementary number was issued, containing a 'retrospect' of books published during the half-year, both in English and other European languages. Later this retrospect or critical survey gave place to extensive selections from perhaps half a dozen new books of the half-year. Among the books thus presented to readers of the *Monthly* was Wordsworth's *Excursion*, which appeared in the supplement for January 1815. It was introduced as 'one of the best poems of this age', and the claim put forward that 'it is scarcely possible that any reader of sensibility can lay it aside till he has finished it'. Nineteen extracts follow, each headed after the manner of the *Elegant Extracts* ('Poor Margaret', 'Study of Nature', 'Transitory Nature of All Things', and so on). The selection emphasizes the moral rather than the mystical Wordsworth.¹

The increasing interest in Spanish, German, and oriental literature at this period is evident in the pages of the *Monthly*. In its early issues Robert Southey contributed some essays on the literature of Spain and Portugal. William Taylor's support ensured that German literature would not be neglected, while it was Thomas Beddoes (the radical physician who employed Humphry Davy in his 'Pneumatic Institution' for the treatment of tuberculosis) who wrote the first article on Kant's philosophy to appear in the magazine, in May 1796. From time to time there were references to the work being done in Sanskrit studies, and the presentation of Indian philosophy to western readers. For example, Maurice's *Indian Antiquities* was discussed in the supplements for January 1798 and July 1799. At a later period three translations were sent to the magazine by Raja Ram Mohan Roy, the Bengali who founded the Brahmo Samaj. The translations were of an abridgement of the Vedanta, and of the Isa and Cena Upanishads. The first translation was introduced by the editor as an attempt to 'render

¹ It is interesting to note which lines were omitted from the character of the Wanderer (*Excursion*, i. 26-433). These include lines 118-62 and 177-96, both of which passages stress the element of fear in the Wanderer's upbringing. Another omitted passage is 219-43, which closes with a reference to the Wanderer's learning to look on Nature with a humble heart and with a *superstitious* eye of love. The unutterable love in the silent faces of the clouds, however, appears to have been more congenial to the rationalism of the magazine. (Line numbers are given from the Oxford text of the *Excursion*, 1949.)

our
Eas
M
of d
he
pop
Mal
disc
T
hum
disc
vent
boys
subj
also
book
whic
their
the
eigh
Soci
to a
was
metr
Th
mind
years
Fran
pages
usual
in th
Brest
well
priso
Maga
which
in the
In
for N
wars'

our miscellany a medium of communication between the learned of the East and the West'.¹

Much space was devoted to economics. Phillips himself was an advocate of dividing up large farms, and pressed his views on the subject whenever he had an opportunity. The argument about Malthus's principle of population was carried on with great vigour in the magazine, and both Malthus and Godwin contributed to it. In 1817 and afterwards there were discussions of the practicability of the plans of Robert Owen.

The magazine was read by many of those who were most active in humanitarian work. Crabb Robinson's friends Dr. Reid and Mary Hays discussed in its pages the more rational treatment of the insane. The prevention of cruelty to animals, the substitution of machines for climbing boys in chimney-sweeping, and the abolition of capital punishment are subjects typical of those to be found discussed in the *Monthly*. Much can also be learnt from it of the progress of literary and philosophical societies, book clubs, and other institutions promoting that diffusion of knowledge which seemed to contemporaries to be one of the greatest achievements of their time. These institutions, indeed, had a good deal in common with the *Monthly Magazine*. In its first nine volumes the magazine published eight papers that had been read to the Newcastle Literary and Philosophical Society. These ranged from a discussion of the use of lime in agriculture to a critique of some of the Italian poets. One paper, by William Enfield, was reprinted as an article in the 'Enquirer' series. Its subject was whether metre was essential to poetry.

The *Monthly Magazine* reflects the cosmopolitan, 'continental' frame of mind that characterized dissenting and other reformist groups during the years of the wars with France. It was notorious for being as partial to France as it dared be. The extremer advocates of war were ridiculed in its pages, and the descriptions of conditions in France which it published were usually studiously fair. In 1797 Robert Southey's brother Tom, who was in the navy, was captured by the French, and spent some time confined in Brest. He was, however, able to procure his release. He had been quite well treated, and Phillips asked Southey 'to get him a full account of the prison treatment, and of the kindness you experienced, to insert in his Magazine, a very good and respectable publication', Southey added, 'in which I occasionally write'.² The account was written, and duly appeared in the next issue, August 1797.

In later years the magazine was accused, with some justice, of partiality for Napoleon. Phillips was denounced for his references to the 'defensive wars' in which France had been engaged, while Capell Lofft (the radical

¹ *Monthly Magazine*, June 1817, p. 391.

² *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, ed. Warter, i. 35. 9 July 1797.

Suffolk squire, who frequently contributed to the *Monthly Magazine* became specially notorious for his claim that Napoleon was entitled to seek asylum in England, and should have benefit of habeas corpus. Charles Lamb's comment is comparatively indulgent. 'That man', he observed to Wordsworth, 'is his own moon. He has no need of ascending into that gentle planet for mild influences.'¹

Not that the magazine was consistently partial to the French. In September 1811, indeed, the writer of the 'State of Public Affairs' in Spain and Portugal wrote a furious denunciation of 'the monster Bonaparte', compared with whom, he said, Robespierre was a lamb. '*We hate war—we hate the trade of blood*—yet this monster ought not, by the common consent of all mankind, to be permitted to continue his enormities.' Evidently Phillips thought that this was going a bit too far, for he added a footnote:

These just, because natural, feelings, relative to the butcheries in Spain, do not compromise questions relative to the justice of the war between France and England—to the propriety of our becoming principals, rather than auxiliaries, in the Spanish war—to the prudence of our advocating the cause of humanity single-handed, &c. &c.²

It is no surprise to find in the *Monthly Magazine* some of the earliest signs of the anti-war reaction which expressed itself after 1815 in the peace societies of Britain and America. In August 1809 a correspondent proposed such a society, which should use the same methods as the anti-slavery movement, and backed his proposal with an offer of fifty pounds to start it. It was not until 1816, however, that a society was formed. Meantime there was some discussion in the magazine about the possible alternatives to war, and a great deal of discussion about the injustice of the war with France.

Unpatriotic behaviour of this kind provided an opening for a loyalist magazine which should imitate the less contentious features of the *Monthly*. In January 1814 Henry Colburn started the *New Monthly Magazine*, identical in appearance with the *Monthly*, but lacking both its sedition and its talent. It struggled on for seven years—Alaric Watts, its editor in 1818 and 1819, has left an amusing account of his troubles in his 'Reminiscences of a Magazine Editor'.³ Then the poet Thomas Campbell became editor, and turned it into a literary magazine. In this form it proved successful, and by 1824 Phillips had found that his own magazine was becoming unprofitable. He disposed of it in that year to Messrs. Cox and Baylis.

Until December 1825 the new owners continued to run it in the same

¹ *The Letters of Charles Lamb*, ed. E. V. Lucas (London, 1935), ii. 169. 9 Aug. 1815.

² *Monthly Magazine*, Sept. 1811, p. 170.

³ See A. A. Watts, *Alaric Watts: A Narrative of his Life* (London, 1884), i. 57-61. Cf. 'Some Passages in the Life of a Magazine Editor', *Literary Magnet* (1826), pp. 40-48.

way as before, the last editor being no less a person than John Thelwall.¹ This survivor of the treason trials of 1794 was typical of those who welcomed the *Monthly* when it first came out. He edited the magazine with the enthusiasm of an old admirer, but his readers do not seem to have responded. The owners dismissed him in November 1825, and the following January a new series was begun. The magazine was put 'on a par with other periodicals'. 'Graver subjects' were to be diversified with humorous, historical, or pathetic 'Original Papers'. 'Politics will, we are glad to hear, be carefully excluded.'²

Thelwall was much offended by his dismissal. He set up his own monthly—the *Panoramic Miscellany*—and in the first number he published a pathetic poem 'To Maga'. This described his thirty years of affection for the *Monthly Magazine*, his joy at having the opportunity to be its editor. But now 'They tear thee from my arms'.

They'll deck thee out in trim array,
More gaudy to the eye;
But steal the inward worth away
That did thy charms supply.³

But there was now no public for the kind of 'inward worth' that charmed Thelwall and his generation. The *Panoramic Miscellany* only lasted for a few numbers. The omnivorous taste for which the *Monthly* had catered was no longer fashionable. Those whose interests were mainly scientific would read periodicals like the *London Journal of Arts and Sciences*, which began in 1820. The encyclopaedic range of the *Monthly's* interests was specially characteristic of the thirty years or so that followed the French Revolution. In 1810 Francis Jeffrey remarked that to be acceptable in society one had to be acquainted with political economy, chemistry, mineralogy, geology, etymology, painting, sculpture, and architecture, with some sort of taste for the picturesque,—and a smattering of German and Spanish literature, and even some idea of Indian, Sanscrit, and Chinese learning and history,—over and above some little knowledge of trade and agriculture.⁴

One is reminded of Charles Lamb's modern schoolmaster—and of Coleridge's course of study in preparation for writing an epic poem:

I would be a tolerable mathematician, I would thoroughly know Mechanics, Hydrostatics, Optics, and Astronomy, Botany, Metallurgy, Fossilism, Chemistry, Geology, Anatomy, Medicine. . . .⁵

¹ The first signs of his management appear in the issue for Dec. 1824. He often inserted his own poems, and added numerous editorial notes to articles by other contributors.

² *Literary Magnet* (1826), p. 54. When Hazlitt wrote for the old *Monthly* it was to confute the materialist view of the mind (see *Monthly Magazine*, Feb. 1809, pp. 15-19). Under the new dispensation he wrote 'On Disagreeable People'.

³ *Panoramic Miscellany* (1826), p. 84. The poem is dated 16 Nov. 1825.

⁴ *Edinburgh Review*, Nov. 1810, p. 168. Review of Dugald Stewart's *Philosophical Essays*.

⁵ *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E. L. Griggs (London, 1932), i. 71.

Shelley, we remember, was an enthusiastic student of the physical sciences, while Humphry Davy wrote verse, some of which is unexpectedly Wordsworthian. These wide ranges of interest were regarded with some uneasiness. The passage from Jeffrey occurs in a discussion of the contemporary distaste for sustained thought on philosophical problems. Hazlitt accused Coleridge of meddling with everything, and marring all that he meddled with. 'Mr C., with great talents, has, by an ambition to be everything, become nothing.'¹ There is a resemblance here to Robberds's comment on William Taylor of Norwich. James Atkinson makes a similar reflection on Thomas Beddoes:

His works embrace a most extensive surface of queries and inquiry; touching, like a vessel of discovery, upon every little topic or island; but yet, with topsails set, as if stinted to time. For, as an author, he appears to have been always in a hurry to reach the mart of novelty and invention, lest others should arrive there before him. . . .²

Atkinson feared that 'in the midst of his efforts to benefit science', his character as a man was 'rather obumbrated' by 'a feeling of charlatany'. Such a feeling certainly obumbrated the character of Richard Phillips, who believed that he had confuted Newton's theory of gravitation, and repeated the confutation on every possible occasion, whether in the *Monthly Magazine* over the signature of 'Common Sense', or in the school textbooks of which he was a prolific publisher.

The merits of the magazine should not be exaggerated. Its contributions are often hastily written and superficial. Yet it expresses some of the intellectual vitality of the early nineteenth century to an extent which makes it worth study. Its readers and contributors were for the most part Dissenters, Quakers, and citizens 'hankering after the "improvement of the mind"' like those whom Talfourd saw at Hazlitt's lectures in the Surrey Institution. Such readers made up a considerable part of those who bought and read what we call 'romantic poetry'. It was a reading public primarily interested in the diffusion of useful knowledge and the improvement of society. They were not in general so rigidly utilitarian as to believe that the discovery of the steam-engine was of more value than all the epic poems that had ever been written.³ Poetry was justified in their eyes if it could be shown that it promoted the welfare of the community. Their view was not, after all, so remote from that of Wordsworth, who claimed that he had 'given twelve hours' thought to the condition and prospects of society, for one to poetry'.⁴

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, Aug. 1817, p. 514.

² James Atkinson, *Medical Bibliography* (London, 1834), p. 331.

³ *Monthly Magazine*, Jan. 1812, p. 531.

⁴ *The Works of the Rev. Orville Dewey* (London, 1844), p. 622.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

CAST OF PLOUGH MONDAY PLAY AT DONINGTON, LINCOLNSHIRE, c. 1563-5

SHORTLY before 1939 some of the parish records from the village of Donington were sent to the then Diocesan Record Office at Lincoln for repair. The collection included the following item, which was recognized by Miss K. Major for what it is and included in an exhibition of parish documents. Reference to it, from the description given in the catalogue of the exhibition, was made by W. E. Tate in *The Parish Chest*, but it has not hitherto been printed. It is now among the records in the custody of the Lincolnshire Archives Committee. It consists of a single sheet of paper, in poor condition and defective; I am indebted to Miss D. M. Williamson, assistant archivist to the Committee, for help in transcribing it. The only evidence of date is that it appears to be contemporary with another single sheet giving the churchwardens' accounts for the years 1563-5, in which the churchwardens render account for 'the plowlyght'. These two documents are numbered 53 and 54 in the collection in question.

butt fendyke for fyndyng []

yt ys Agreyd by the consent of ye hole parysh yt every man yt [] hys
tymes here after specyfyed to forfeyt for every tyme yt [] do xij d apece
for every playn yt ys to say

george atkynson
John wryght repth
John Seneat (?) ye steward
John Jaykes holofernes
Edward danyell

John Rayner
John love] iij yong men

Wm browne

ye messyngers

John toplydye

thomas watson

Robt browne

ye Knyghts

John elward

John stennynt

(Signatures)

John Wryght

Jhon \boxtimes Newton

Sawdone ~~thomas dyconson~~

ye duke John ~~page~~ wryght

Wm strayker messynger

John law ye harowld

~~John~~ Knyghts

thomas playn

Robertt lawranson

(Signatures)

John \dagger Toplydye

John Renet

be me george Atkynson

be me John Sugar

Robert Sh

The document provides the most vivid illustration so far available of the efforts of the east Midland village to maintain a custom whose observance had been dislocated by the abolition in 1546 of the religious guilds with which it had been associated. Although the heading is defective (the words in square brackets are missing) the meaning is clear: any member who failed to play his part forfeited twelvecence for each performance missed. The words at the top are not a title but part of a note added after the cast had been listed, and they seem to indicate that part of the parish known as Butt Fen Dyke was responsible for a particular contribution which we cannot now know. The list is not easy to interpret; it looks as if the original intention was a list of players in the left-hand column and their parts in the right, but the alterations, all in the same hand and probably made on the one occasion, have made it inconsistent. George Atkynson presumably played the Sultan; Thomas Dyconson's name is crossed out. John Wryght 'repth', i.e. representeth, the Duke, and Page has been crossed out. There appears to be no part for Edward Danyell. Three Messengers are listed on the left and a fourth, William Strayker, on the right. Two Knights are named on the left; on the right the clerk, after starting another name, John, crossed it out and added two more Knights, Thomas Playn and Robert Lawranson. The list is signed by four of the players; the third name in the left-hand column has not been read with certainty but does not seem to be that of John Sugar, one of the signatories. The list is also signed by John Newton and Robert Sh——, who did not complete his name. The cast thus appears to consist of the Sultan, the Duke, the Steward, the Herald, Holofernes, three Young Men, three or four Messengers, and four Knights.

The cast is of great interest to the student of Plough Monday plays, which are the Danelaw equivalent of the Christmas Mumming plays, Pace Egg plays, and Soul Cake plays of other parts of England. The oldest text is that from Revesby, Lincs.,¹ which is dated 1779, but is a completely literary version, produced by or for Sir Joseph Banks, the then President of the Royal Society, who lived at Revesby Abbey. Donington lies in the Lincolnshire fens south-west of Boston. The survival of the document is in no way surprising; the fenland villages were among the largest² and wealthiest in England, and their parish records are rich. Bequests in late medieval wills to village guilds are more frequent in the

¹ The Revesby text is printed by E. K. Chambers, *The English Folk Play*, pp. 105-20. Apart from this complete version, a quotation from the speech of St. George in the Mumming Play performed at Exeter in 1738 is quoted by Andrew Brice as a note to his *Mobiad*, Canto iv. See C. Radford, 'Three Centuries of Playgoing in Exeter', *Trans. of the Devonshire Association*, lxxxii (1950), 249-50, 268.

² See Joan Thirsk, *Fenland Farming in the Sixteenth Century* (Leicester, 1953), pp. 10-13.

fens than in any other part of the county, and as common as in the equally wealthy villages of East Anglia. There are also references to the plough light in seven other churches beside Donington. Those who had belonged to the guild and maintained the light had also performed the play. On the other hand, the performance seems to have died out earlier in the fens than elsewhere, and of the large number of texts which have been collected recently,¹ none comes from the fens. The Donington characters do not appear in surviving versions from other villages, but the place of the Donington play in the lineage of the Plough Monday play is not in doubt. A play of *Holofernes* may have been performed before the Princess Elizabeth in London in 1554, and 'a sawdon' was included in a performance there a year earlier of what Professor Baskervill called 'almost certainly an adaptation of a mummers' play'.²

M. W. BARLEY

MOTH'S *L'ENVOY* AND THE COURTIER IN *LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST*

IN Act III of *Love's Labour's Lost*, Moth and Armado, the phantastical Spaniard, leaving poor Costard to call for a plantain for his broken shin, engage each other's wits for many lines over some nonsense verse. Armado, after explaining to Moth the meaning of *l'envoy* as 'an epilogue or discourse, to make plain Some obscure precedence that hath tofore been sain' (82-83), recites the moral:

The fox, the ape, and the humble-bee,
Were still at odds, being but three;

to which Moth adds his *l'envoy*:

Until the goose came out of door,
And stay'd the odds by adding four.

G. B. Harrison in his recent edition of Shakespeare comments: 'These apparently meaningless lines are presumably a topical jest at someone's expense.'³ T. W. Baldwin remarks: 'The jesting between Armado and Moth is but loosely attached to the plot and may or may not have been in

¹ There are now at least thirty texts from Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, and Leicestershire which were not known to E. K. Chambers, and the writer hopes shortly to publish an account of them in the *Journal of the English Folkdance and Song Society*.

² E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, ii. 196 and note, commenting on a statement in Warton's *History of Poetry*; C. R. Baskervill, 'Mummers' Wooing Plays in England', *M.P.*, xxi (1924), 230.

³ Shakespeare: *The Complete Works*, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York, 1948, 1952), p. 406, note.

the original structure.¹ And H. Granville-Barker, though he would not in production omit these lines and the scene containing them, nevertheless feels that they do not have any significance.² In view of these criticisms, it is not inappropriate to suggest that these 'meaningless lines' may serve a structural and thematic purpose in the play. They are in a way a humorous foreshadowing of Act IV, Sc. iii, where the King and his courtiers so delightfully reveal that they have forsworn themselves by falling in love.

For there is a parallel between the nonsense verse and the situation of Act IV, Sc. iii. At the beginning of this scene, the King and his companions all reveal their loves to us, the audience (Berowne's folly is known only to us; the King's only to Berowne and us; Longaville's to the King, Berowne, and us; and poor Dumain's to everybody). After Dumain's self-revelation, Longaville steps forward and chastises him for breaking his vow; the King in turn rebukes the two courtiers; and Berowne, unaware of his own impending disaster, makes fun of all three. Up to this point we have the moral of the nonsense verse reflected in the humorous situation: the King, Longaville, and Dumain are, we can see, 'the fox, the ape, and the humble-bee'. It only needs Berowne's misdirected letter to come to light—which it does most swiftly—to make the *l'envoy* of the situation.

Goose-Berowne even verbally echoes Moth's and Armado's lines in his confession to his fellows 'That you three fools lack'd me fool to make up the mess' (207); and to Dumain's 'Now the number is even', he replies, 'True, true; we are four' (211). The odds have indeed been stayed.

STANLEY B. GREENFIELD

A NOTE ON DONNE'S *CROSSE*

DONNE has sometimes been censured for the 'baroque conceits' of the following lines in *The Crosse*:

Who can deny mee power, and liberty
To stretch mine armes, and mine owne Crosse to be?
Swimme, and at every stroake, thou art thy Crosse,
The Mast and yard make one, where seas doASSE.
Looke downe, thou spiest out Crosses in smalle things;
Looke up, thou seest birds rais'd on crossed wings;
All the Globes frame, and spheares, is nothing else
But the Meridians crossing Parallels. (ll. 17-24.)

Miss Helen Gardner has noted in her admirable edition of the *Divine Poems* that the 'conceit' of l. 20 is found as early as Justin Martyr, and that

¹ T. W. Baldwin, *Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana, 1947), p. 596.

² H. Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (Princeton, 1951), ii. 441.

Herbert's *De Signaculo Crucis* repeats the commonplace of l. 19.¹ In fact, all of the likenesses that Donne here assembles were noticed and collected by early Christian writers. The most concise list is in the Commentary ascribed to St. Jerome (*In Marcum*, cap. xv):

Ipsa species Crucis, quid est nisi forma quadrata mundi? . . . Aves, quando volant ad aethera, formam Crucis assumunt. Homo natans per aquas, vel orans, forma crucis vehitur. Navis per maria, antenna cruci similata sufflatur.

(Migne, *P.L.*, xxx. 638.)

Minutius Felix (*In Dialog. Octavio*) elaborates a little, in phrases similar to Donne's:

Signum sane Crucis naturaliter visimus in navi, cum velis tumentibus vehitur, cum expansis palmulis labitur: et cum erigitur iugum, Crucis signum est: et cum homo porrectis manibus Deum pura mente veneratur. (*P.L.*, iii. 346.)

Maximus of Turin (*De Cruce Domini*, Homil. II) adds the likeness of the quartered globe:

Cælum quoque ipsum huius signi figura dispositum est. Nam cum quatuor partibus, hoc est Oriente, et Occidente, ac Meridiano, et Septentrione, distinguitur, quatuor quasi Crucis angulis continetur. . . . (*P.L.*, lvii. 342.)

These passages, together with the passage from Justin Martyr's *Apology* (which includes other figures not found in Donne or in the sources cited above), were excerpted by Lipsius in *De Cruce*, chap. ix, Book 1 (Antwerp, 1595). All the separate editions of this work, as well as the collected editions of Lipsius (Leyden, 1613, &c.), include an illustration showing a swimmer, a bird, a praying man, a sail in the crosswise position, and similar figures. The illustration perhaps caught Donne's eye; it certainly caught Gibbon's, as we know from his remarks on the vision of Constantine.

J. A. W. BENNETT

¹ Mr. Leishman draws attention to the sources for this 'conceit' in his review of Miss Gardner's edition of the *Divine Poems* printed in the last number of this journal (p. 81); but readers may be glad to have the greater detail given in this Note, which was, of course, written before the review appeared.—EDITOR.

A NOTE ON MILTON'S PUNCTUATION

Bold deed thou hast presum'd, adventurous *Eve*,
 And peril great provok't, who thus hath dar'd
 Had it been onely coveting to Eye
 That sacred Fruit, sacred to abstinence,
 Much more to taste it under banne to touch.

(*Paradise Lost*, IX. 921-5; ed. 2)

My comment concerns the second line of this passage. In the first edition this line (viii. 922) reads *hast dar'd* for *hath dar'd*. Most editors consider the *hath* of the second edition to be a misprint, though it can be justified grammatically and should therefore be accepted as Milton's own emendation. But it is the punctuation I wish to comment on. The punctuation of line 922, according to H. F. Fletcher's facsimile edition, is identical in all copies of both the first and the second editions, yet the error has established itself that there is a comma at the end of the line in the original editions. This error seems to derive from Bentley and Newton, though they were not conscious of tampering with the text but only of doing what any eighteenth- or nineteenth-century editor thought his duty—of endeavouring to elucidate the syntax by means of modern, grammatical punctuation. Both of them follow the first edition in printing *hast dar'd*, and both silently insert a comma after *dar'd*. Bentley has no note on the line but Newton's note, repeated by Todd and others, says: 'So it is in the first edition, but in the second by mistake it is printed *hath dar'd*, and that is follow'd in some others.' Although this comment does not refer to the punctuation it was no doubt responsible for establishing the error that the original editions have a comma at the end of line 922. Masson drew attention to this error: 'There is no comma or other point after "*dar'd*" in the original; nor is any necessary—though the syntax is rather complex.' (*Milton's Poetical Works*, 1890.) Nevertheless, Verity in his edition of *Paradise Lost* (1910) says: 'The original editions have a comma after *dar'd*, . . . Some editors remove the comma after *dar'd* and make the construction *dared to eye*: a needless change, I think.' And Merritt Hughes in his edition (1935), although he omits the comma in his text, says: 'Originally a comma followed *dar'd*, making *to eye* depend upon *coveting*.'

If we are to tamper with Milton's punctuation it would perhaps be better to follow Keightley, who puts a dash at the end of line 922. But the fact is that Milton commonly allows the metrical pause at the end of a line to do the work of punctuation; and the loaded stresses of the last three syllables of this line—*thus hath (hast) dar'd*—do enforce a heavy pause, the equivalent of Keightley's dash. Here and elsewhere we had much better leave Milton's economical pointing alone, for fear of disturbing rhythm and sense.

B. A. WRIGHT

POPE'S HAND IN THOMAS BIRCH'S
ACCOUNT OF GAY

THOMAS BIRCH's biography of John Gay, first published in 1736,¹ concludes with the following note: 'For several particulars in this Article we are obliged to two very ingenious Gentlemen, *Aaron Hill* Esq; and *Richard Savage* Esq; the latter of whom procured this article to be revised by *Alexander Pope* Esq.' In the early pages of the Birch diary (British Museum Additional Manuscripts) is a hitherto unpublished and unknown letter of Pope's,² copied out in Birch's hand, and relating to the above transactions:

D^r S^r

I answer Yours by the first Post, since I find they are in so much Hast about Mr Gay's Life. It is not possible for me to do his Memory the Justice I wish in so much Hurry. Therefore I would by no means have my Name made use of, where I cannot have the Account such as it ought. I only recommend to your Friendship, that nothing be said of any particular Obligations that worthy & ingenious Man had to me, further than a sincere Esteem & the Natural Effe[ct] of it. I am sure they will do him Injustice, if they say more on that Article. And as to that of his being apprenticed to one *Willet*, &c. what are such things to the public? Authors are to be remember'd by the Works & Merits, not Accidents of their Lives. But if they will speak of his Condition of Life, let them remember to say *he was born of an ancient Family, & Secretary, not Servant, to the Duchess of Monmouth*. As to that, which would be most material, his true Character, it was every way amiable; & none of his Schoolfellows could draw that, which was manifested in the future Course of his Life to those of the Nobility & first Genius's of his time, who lov'd him, & with whom he convers'd intirely. I take Mr. Hill's Zeal very kindly, & it is agreeable to that spirit & Warmth // which he always shews for Virtue & Learning. I am only afraid of his exceeding in what he says concerning me. I do own, I wish, since I cannot now contribute (upon the foot the Work stands) any *Additions*, that I might have the power of some Expunctions, & could see the Proofs to that End. Otherwise it will be better I should not be privy to the least of the matter. I shall be in London, & will be heard of at Mr. Dodsley's in five or six Days. Adieu, D^r S^r & believe me, without forms, affectionately Yours.

A Pope.

Southampton Oct. 17th, 1736.

Pope's designs on the Gay article appear to have been extensive enough at this point. But before they are examined in detail, two basic facts about

¹ *A General Dictionary, Historical and Critical* (London, 1734-41), v. 406-8. The authors and minor collaborators in this important biographical encyclopaedia are discussed in Mr. James M. Osborn's 'Thomas Birch and the *General Dictionary*', *M.P.*, xxxvi (1938), 25-46.

² Add. MS. 4478c, ff. 17-18. This letter follows the diary entry for 15 Oct. 1736.

the letter should be set forth. These are implied in a communication from Richard Savage to Birch, to be found elsewhere in the Birch papers:

Dear Sir,

You see by y^e Enclosed How y^e Affair stands—I wish any Means c^d be found to serve you—Pray send me a Note what you w^d have me do, & please at y^e same time to return me M^r Pope's Letter.

Y^rs affectionately

R: Savage.

[Oc]t: 19: 1736

Please to direct for me to Child's Coffee House, & on y^e Receipt of your's I will again (if necessary) write [to M] P.¹

In the absence of any known reasons for doubting the conjectural readings as indicated (matter in brackets), it will follow that Pope's letter was addressed to Savage, and Savage in turn lent it to Thomas Birch. The interest and value of a genuine and unedited Pope letter, evident even in 1736, and Birch's need for an accurate memorandum of Pope's wishes with regard to the life of Gay, can perhaps sufficiently account for his labour in copying out the text.

When the article on Gay is read over in the light of the letter, it is evident that all of Pope's suggestions were carried out. The recommended phrases—'born of an antient family in Devonshire' and 'Secretary to the Duchess of Monmouth'—are both employed; and there is no mention of Willet the mercer, or of an apprenticeship, or of the testimonies of Gay's school-fellows. Pope's desire to gloss over the less elegant passages of his friend's life appears, then, to have been satisfied. The injunction against the use of Pope's name was perhaps overcome when, within a few days of the letter, the proof-sheets were duly submitted, in accordance with Pope's wishes. Birch's diary entry for 1 November 1736 records this second transaction: 'Recd the Proof sheet of the Article of M^r Gay from M^r Pope, who alter'd the first Line in his Epitaph of that Poet.'² But the epitaph as printed in the *General Dictionary*, following Pope's revision, lacks the second couplet of the final version. Birch could have had it from the complete and verbally accurate version printed in the *London Evening-Post* of 8–10 July 1736, the opening lines of which follow:

Of Manners gentle, of Affections mild,
In Wit a Man, Simplicity, a Child;
With native Humour temp'ring virtuous Rage,
Form'd to delight at once and lash the Age.
Above Temptation in a low Estate,
And uncorrupted, e'en among the Great.

In its omission of the second couplet ('With native Humour . . .') the *General Dictionary* version corresponds to the penultimate form of the

¹ Add. MS. 4318, f. 44.

² Add. MS. 4478c, f. 18.

epitaph found in the octavo edition of *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq.*, 1735 (ii. 170). Since Pope 'alter'd the first Line' Birch's proof-sheets must have contained an antepenultimate version differing in two respects from the final one. Such a version had appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for June 1736 (vi. 348):

Severe of morals, but of nature mild;
In wit a man—Simplicity a child;
Above temptation, in a low estate,
And uncorrupted, ev'n among the great.

Birch might have used this originally, or he might have found it in the 1735 folio edition of *The Works of Mr. Alexander Pope*, Volume II.¹

If one considers that the life of Gay was not scheduled for publication until 2 December 1736,² Birch would seem to have been concerned about an unexpectedly early dead-line. The article on Gay, however, was almost certainly printed on the first of twenty folio sheets comprising the December instalment of the *General Dictionary*, a work published serially over a period of eight years. The requirements of a printer's compositor may accordingly be presumed to account for Birch's apparent haste.

While I have been unable to find either the text of the draft originally read by Pope, or the proof-sheets mentioned in the diary entry, some idea of the substance of these early versions may be had from another stray item in the Birch papers. This is a memorandum in Birch's hand, concerning Gay, written neatly on one side of a mutilated sheet of paper, and lacking a heading. The text is worth reprinting at this time as a very early document in Gay's biography:

Educated at Barnstaple in Devonshire at a large Free Scho[ol] of near 500 Boys under direction of M^r W. Rayner, an excellent M^r who had been educated at Westminster & for[m]ed himself & his manner upon an Imitation of the meth[od] of that School. Left a Mercer (M^r Willet in the Strand) to whom his Friends, mistaking his Genius, h[ad] bound him Apprentice. He had a small Fortune at h[is] Disposal; but far from sufficient to support him in that independent Condition of life, to w^{ch} the [freedom] of his Spirit adapted his desire; & which the Indolence [of] his Temper in some sort made necessary to his Happ[iness]. He had no other post than abovemention'd during the Life of Q. Anne.

¹ I am indebted to Professor John Butt for information on earlier versions of the Gay epitaph. The history of Pope's revisions will be more fully dealt with in the edition of Pope's *Minor Poems* (Twickenham Edition, vi) prepared by the late Norman Ault, and completed, for publication in the near future, by Professor Butt.

² *The Country Journal or Craftsman*, Saturday, 4 Dec. 1736. The *General Dictionary* advertisement in this issue begins: 'On Thursday last was published Numb. XLII. . . . It specifically mentions the life of Gay. Such fascicles were regularly published on the first Thursday of each month.'

But the Death of that Princess falling out about the time, in which he had by t[he] Journey to Hanover, contracted a new Courtl[y way] of thinking, & a considerable Acquaintance with persons, whom that Accident threw suddenly in[to] Power, introduc'd him at once in that track wh[ere] he afterwards met with such a lucky Concurrence [of] Circumstances, & became known to & esteem'd by [the] public.¹

William Rayner (or Raynor, 1664?-1730) was Master of the Free Grammar School at Barnstaple from 1680 to 1698. Gay entered this school in 1694. At the time about thirty boys were enrolled; '500 Boys' is an impossible figure.² Both Rayner and his successor Robert Luck, who also taught Gay, were alumni of Westminster School, where they must both have come under the powerful influence of the famous Dr. Richard Busby. As in the early memoir by Gay's nephew, the Rev. Joseph Baller, the above account neglects to mention Gay's service with the Duchess of Monmouth just prior to the period in Hanover when Gay was secretary to Lord Clarendon. This circumstance makes it even harder to doubt that Gay served the Duchess in some 'low' capacity. Of Willet the mercer I have been unable to develop further information. I have not found his name in the published sources on Gay.

E. L. RUHE

JANE AUSTEN AND CRABBE

DR. CHAPMAN has shown that Jane Austen often preferred to use or adapt proper names from other writers. An instance of this which, I believe, has not previously been noted, is that of the heroine of *Mansfield Park*. In *The Parish Register*, Part II (1807), Jane Austen's favourite poet Crabbe had written:

Sir Edward Archer is an amorous knight,
And maidens chaste and lovely shun his sight;
His bailiff's daughter suited much his taste,
For Fanny Price was lovely and was chaste.

E. E. DUNCAN-JONES

¹ Add. MS. 4475, f. 27.

² For facts on Barnstaple School I am indebted to Mr. Alfred E. Blackwell, Head Librarian and Curator of the North Devon Athenaeum, Barnstaple.

REVIEWS

Beowulf with the Finnesburg Fragment. Edited by C. L. WRENN. Pp. 318. London: Geo. C. Harrap & Co., 1953. 21s. net.

A new edition of *Beowulf* for English use was a growing need and Professor Wrenn's, issued in a convenient and attractive form, is something of an event in Anglo-Saxon scholarship. Klaeber's edition has been kept abreast of recent research only by the awkward method of supplements, and, though indispensable as always, is not entirely suited to undergraduates beginning the study. Professor Wrenn's is primarily designed for them. It aims to provide everything which the non-specialist requires, amplifying by references to the literature on particular points. That means a fairly elaborate introduction, including a sufficient account of the manuscript, some discussion of its transmission, the date and dialect of the original, and other matters necessary for the interpretation of the poem. The treatment is full and judicious and the conclusions, accepted or not, demand respectful consideration. The text deviates from the manuscript as little as possible, is printed with but few footnotes and these dealing with emendations accepted in the text and completions from Thorkelin's transcripts. The commentary is relatively slight, being lightened by transference to the glossary of many difficulties of reading or interpretation. Experience will prove if the practice is wise; it may at least compel recognition of doubt or difficulty. It should be added that *Finnesburg* is printed with a glossary but no commentary.

To criticize in detail and in a brief review any edition of *Beowulf* is an impossible task. A few selected points only can be discussed and even these briefly. It seems wiser also to deal with some of the more general questions or those which have a wider application. Professor Wrenn has no doubt textual readings, interpretations, an evaluation of the relative evidence, which, like most other scholars, he is prepared to defend *contra mundum*. These, so far as they appear here, are always interesting and suggestive, and demand earnest consideration, perhaps most where they excite dissent. On difficult questions the critic, too, can in a review offer only a personal judgement, and what is advanced in criticism here is a suggestion of doubt or more often a plea for reconsideration.

I begin with a fundamental question discussed in the Introduction, the date and incidentally the dialect of the original. Professor Wrenn decides for the first half of the eighth century though evidently in sympathy with Miss D. Whitelock's cautious and carefully argued plea for a date later by half a century or more. His chief argument for his date is the archaic form *wundini*. Archaisms can be retained in the text only when they are so disguised as to be unrecognizable by the copyist and so mechanically preserved, or else when they are susceptible of another and erroneous explanation. If we could be sure (as assuredly we can not) that the manuscript in l. 2097 had *bræc* as in Thorkelin's transcript A, we could explain it as an early-eighth-century form for *brēc* and an example of the second type mentioned above, and *hrærg* in l. 175 does look like an example of the first, but *wundini* belongs to neither. It is speaking strictly irregular besides,

for it should have mutation and syncopation. Both objections can easily be explained away, but they need to be, and when we add the unlikelihood of survival in a late copy when clearly understood, three unusual features seem to leave room for a very reasonable doubt. Though I believe the earlier date is just, there is, nevertheless, no convincing linguistic evidence to establish it. It has been said that Professor Wrenn is much in sympathy with Miss Whitelock's arguments on date as well as on other points, e.g. Mercian provenance, further supported by his view of the Vespasian Psalter gloss. This is not the place to examine these arguments or theories, but as they underlie not a few of his statements and conclusions a word may be permitted. Miss Whitelock and he emphasize in particular the developed state of Christianity in poet and audience, notably evidenced in language. Both, as it seems to me, underestimate the depth of penetration of Christian thought and language in the early period, at least in Northumbria, leaving out of account the method of conversion there. Aidan came, to borrow Bede's words on Columba, *praedicaturus verbum Dei*, and he and his successors (even Wilfrid), with a long Celtic tradition of missionary activity behind them, sought out the people and preached directly to them. That they could not do without a rendering in the vernacular of essential Christian ideas either by an adoption of old pagan terms in a new sense or by a translation into English. It is not credible that Caedmon invented *touldurfadur*, *eci dryctin*, *aelda barnum* and the like. The words and phrases in question were no doubt familiar and usual in Christian poetry, but they or many of them were so because already familiar in vernacular use. As for *non*, it was something more important to the layman than an office of the Church: it was the hour as the Peterborough Chronicle has it, *þa men eten*, the main meal of the day, and it is worth noting that when Beowulf returned safe to Heorot he found the Danes at dinner. Bede tells us that many *religiosi* had the habit of fasting till noon, and the habit spread to the laity, for he tells us further, in connexion with an incident in the life of Cuthbert while still a layman, that most of the devout (*plerique fidelium*) had adopted it on Fridays. That was in the middle of the seventh century. The early currency of *non* is easily understood.

One other point may be added. Following Tolkien, exception is taken to ll. 180-8 as disturbing in metre and sense. That is a matter of subjective judgement and I can only say that they do not seem so to me. In ll. 183-5, translated (p. 67) 'woe shall it be to him who is destined in dire distressful wise to thrust his soul into the fire's embrace', the words *þurh slōðne nið* in my judgement do not mean 'in dire distressful wise' but 'in stubborn enmity', i.e. by perverse adherence to paganism, appropriate to an early date when paganism by relapse or otherwise could still be a menace, but singularly inappropriate to the later eighth or early ninth century. Finally we have to me the astonishing fact that a poem composed in the profoundly Christian—I do not say devout—society of that time does not refer, if we except hell and damnation, even obliquely to a single essential tenet or belief, such as after-life, of the Christian faith, or even mention the name of Christ.

I turn to the matter of text, 'as little altered by emendation as seemed possible'. Emendation is not excluded, but on the principle of conservatism in form and

inflexion Professor Wrenn is at one with the view set out more strictly by Hoops (*Studien*, p. 4). There can be no question of attempting to restore an *ur-text*. Even if we could determine a precise date we should be no nearer success, and a degree of conservatism is imposed on any editor. The question is what limits we should set. Our manuscript of the end of the tenth century is a copy and no doubt a copy of a copy, and has no claim to be authoritative as representing the language of any period. It is not even an accurate copy. It frequently omits words and phrases, it has very numerous corrections by the scribe or another, and there are many errors left uncorrected. The immediate original seems to belong to the earlier half of the century and as there is fairly abundant material of those dates it should be possible within limits to determine what belongs to the later or the earlier stage. Moreover the manuscript was not written in a district outside the sphere of the West-Saxon *koine* or yet on the outer fringe, and to cite Northumbrian confusion of form and inflexion is quite out of court. Confusion of *ea* and *æ* is later than our period as also the occurrence of weak genitive plurals in *-an*. Isolated examples may be found about the turn of the century but so can late instances of *hwæper* for *hwæder*, of intrusive *h* and the like which could equally claim retention. In fact the 'classical' OE. of the late tenth century is remarkably pure in form and inflexion.

Klaeber remarks (p. 278) that it is not easy to reconcile reasonable respect for the copyists and the presumptive claims of the author, and we should add of the text before the copyists. They copied as we copy a more or less familiar language, by words or groups of words, not letter by letter. For example when they wrote *helle* l. 1816, *hælepum* l. 332, *handgripe* l. 965, *hilde* l. 2298, *hildplegan* l. 1073, perhaps also *heaðabearna* l. 2037, the mental picture at the moment was *hell*, *hælep*, *hand*, *hild*, *bearn*, not *hæle*, *æpelo*, *mund*, *wig* (if we accept it), *lind*, or *beardan*. It is true also of *gehedde* l. 505 as if from *hēdan* not *hēgan*, of *hwæðre* l. 2819 and *fæder gearwum* l. 3119, and to alter the last two to *hræðre*, *fæðer* instead of *hreðre*, *feðer* seems to me a kind of pedantry. Hoops writes as if an edition pushed the manuscript into limbo. That can never be, and recourse to the original is the editor's first duty. It is also his duty to endeavour in the first place to explain the traditional text. Light has come on many points once deemed obscure or corrupt, and on others light may come in the future to justify the text. At the same time it ought to be kept clear that many attempts to explain difficulties in the text are themselves conjectures, or make assumptions which are so: historical fact, existence of some word or sense, grammatical form, phonological development, metrical licence, or abnormal syntax. I cite as examples of different kinds, *ēst*, *herige*, *oferhigian*, *onsæce* (l. 1942), *gimme rice*, *sīðas sigehwile*, *heardran hæle* (l. 719), *unhar*, *lenge* (l. 83). It is no less the duty of the editor to deal with the text in the light of the established results of scholarship.

These observations are not directed specially to this edition. Professor Wrenn is alive to most of them and does not shrink from changes in the text though he prints it at times where he himself doubts. Comments are added on a few selected points. The two new readings of the manuscript must be left to those with opportunity to consult it. I take first some instances where doubt of the text handed down (and printed) must arise and where a reconsideration for a

subsequent edition is suggested. I merely mention *earme* l. 1117, hardly explicable grammatically and where his own preference appears to be *ēame*, *felasinnigne* l. 1379, doubtful on other grounds than alliteration and not thought worthy of being glossed, and *hroden* l. 1151 printed without comment though objectionable alike in metre and sense. I deal in slight detail with *hēoðe* l. 404, *wundum heard* l. 2687, and *gūpmōd grummon* l. 306. The first is, as usual, supported by reference to *helheoðo* in *Satan* l. 700, of uncertain sense and baffling etymology. It is worth remembering that Beowulf too was *cynna gemyndig* and would not address Hrothgar till they were face to face. When he halted (*gestōd*) he would in fact be on the hearth for the king sat with the fire in front of him, and we surely must have a definite point for his coming to a stand. In the second, 'toughened by wounds' is a very bold rendering, and *āhyrded heaposwāte* is not really parallel. Damascening could be produced by plunging steel in an acid bath and the use (or supposed use) of blood with like effect is logical enough, also an extension to 'tempered by blood', but 'by wounds' is another matter. In l. 304 the emendation *hlēorbergan* is accepted and the passage accurately punctuated with a heavy stop after it, making the adjectives which follow refer to it, the helmet, and thus explaining *hēold*, but the consequence that *hlēorbergan* must then be singular is not drawn. It can only be Beowulf's helmet and the sentence incomplete at *hēold*, for we should be told so by some completion like *gūpmōdgum on*. On the contrary *gūpmōd grummon* is retained. The verb is not fairly rendered by 'were excited'. It always has the sense of noise, something which can be heard, 'rage' or 'roar', and is quite inappropriate to the occasion. Moreover, *gūpmōd* if anything must be a noun (as taken here) and nothing like it appears in OE.—in *tornmōd*, *mihtmōd* the first element occurs as adjective as well as noun, and there are no others. Even if we could admit it the words 'war-minds raged, were fierce, were excited' make no real sense.

Among emendations I mention only *Eorle* l. 6, *walu* l. 1031, *heoroblāc* l. 2488, and for *werefyhtum* l. 457. Reference to the Eruli has attracted many but there are linguistic difficulties, and if the forgotten name was confused with *eorl* it seems more likely on the whole that the manuscript had *eorlas*. *Walu* seems needless; if *maga* can develop from *magu* so can *wala* from *walu*. The other two are a return to older readings. The objection to *hildeblāc* seems equally applicable to all compounds with *blāc* and *flōdblāc* is justification enough for *hildeblāc*. Finally for *werefyhtum* remains to me a highly doubtful expression. I doubt the form of the compound, like Sievers I doubt the use of *for* expressing purpose to undertake some activity, and we expect a parallel to *for ārstafum*. What I think of is a word like *wercystum* (it is not exactly invented, see Schönfeld, p. 250, and cf. *gumcystum*), i.e. 'on account of your own excellent qualities and of your grace (or kindness) you have come'.

Annexed are a few general comments. Double gender for *cræft* is noted though dubious, but not for *frōfor* where it is certain. The remarkable form *telge* is probably an error, and *sinnihte* is neuter *j*-stem. In l. 810 *myrðe* is glossed as 'murderous' and this supported by citing *hrædwyrde* from *word*, but *hrædwyrde* is a bahuvrihi compound of the later formation like *idelhende*, and these are relatively rare in Anglo-Saxon poetry compared with the relative frequency of the

older type (*blōdigtoð*). *Myrðe* could only be an abstraction of the second element in independent use and, so far as I know, such do not occur, at least early. There is no *hende* or *wyrde*. For *dēog* l. 850 Professor Wrenn is evidently attracted by the possibility of an OE. verb 'die' and calls in Orm's *dezen* in support, asserting that the reduction of the Scandinavian diphthong is too late for Norse origin. The date of the change is not certain but, nevertheless, earlier than Orm, and Max. Förster (*Themse*, p. 263 n.) has called attention to Alfred's *Blēcinga-ēg* in *Orosius* (Sweet, p. 20, 3). English may have had no diphthong *ei* but a real diphthong would have been written then *eg*, and the spelling is proof that it was no longer so. In the phrase *stōd on stapole* l. 926 the obvious sense of *stapol* is rejected as usual. Bede in his account of the death of Aidan tells us that he was *adclinis destinae*, leaning on the supporting post or buttress of the church. The translator renders it *on pære styðe stondende*. It is not to be supposed that his readers thought that Aidan in dying climbed on the buttress, or took the words in any other way than that he was standing at or by it.

R. GIRVAN

Piers the Plowman: A Critical Edition of the A-Version. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary by THOMAS A. KNOTT and DAVID C. FOWLER. Pp. x+302. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1952; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. \$4.50; 36s. net.

Ever since the days of the controversy of forty years ago between Knott on the one hand and Chambers and Grattan on the other, students of *Piers Plowman* have been aware of the need for a new edition of the A-text. Two clear points of agreement emerged from the dispute: the first, that the Vernon MS., upon which Skeat principally relied, gives a misleading impression of the original; the second, that T (MS. R 3. 14 in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge) provides the most suitable basis for a critical text. The present edition combines Knott's hitherto unpublished text of A1 (i.e. as far as Passus VIII, l. 126) with Dr. Fowler's text of the remainder of the poem.

The editors quote the conclusion reached by Chambers and Grattan in 1909 that an A-text based upon the group of manuscripts which includes T and, to a less degree, upon the Vernon group would bear a much closer resemblance to Skeat's B-text than does Skeat's A-text. Now that such a text is available, the justice of this claim is apparent.

The present edition is described as a 'compromise between a critical and a reading edition' (p. viii). The textual notes and the introductory section on the manuscripts and the establishment of the text are intended for the '*Piers Plowman* scholar', whilst the rest of the critical apparatus is given for the benefit of the 'undergraduate student of Middle English'. One feels that the desired compromise might have been more effectively achieved if a less wide divergence between the interests and needs of the two categories of readers had been assumed.

The section on the critical text opens with the statement that scholars have long recognized the need for an edition of *Piers Plowman* 'based on modern

methods of textual criticism' (p. 20). Agreement on the nature of modern methods is apparently taken for granted; the phrase is not expanded or defined. The editors' own views on the subject are shown, however, in the short account of the basis of the text:

The readings adopted into the critical text are always the critical readings, as attested in every case by the weight of evidence, genealogical and other. No matter how plausible the reading of T may seem, it must not be retained if not supported (p. 28).

But this is taken over from Knott's 'Essay toward the Critical Text of the A-version' (*Modern Philology*, xii), written in 1915, and the methods of textual criticism then in favour can no longer be sure of universal acceptance as modern. One may question the modernity of presenting in the form of a simple genealogical tree the evidence upon which the classification of the manuscripts is based. As long ago as 1916 Chambers and Grattan countered Knott's insistence on the primary necessity for 'constructing a family tree' with the suggestion that 'the adoration of trees is a form of fetish-worship now growing out of date'.²

The task of producing a coherent statement of reasonable length out of the mass of material relating to the text cannot have been easy. The policy adopted in the account of the critical text has been to condense the editors' previous work down to a general outline of their conclusions, and to refer the reader for detailed evidence to Knott's article and to Dr. Fowler's unpublished dissertation. This method has the advantage of avoiding the welter of capital letters and line numbers which so often makes a textual introduction difficult to follow, but the '*Piers Plowman* scholar' may feel that the condensation has been carried too far. The principles on which the text has been established would be made much clearer if a few selected readings were discussed by way of example. An extensive selection of variants is given in the Textual Notes, and reference to this list enables the reader to see where the reading of T has been rejected; but the citation of variants unaccompanied by comment is not always sufficient to show the reason for that rejection.

The undergraduate student is provided with a sketch of the historical background which takes up half the Introduction. Some of the information given here is so elementary that one hopes that no student will require it; some of it is duplicated in the Explanatory Notes, as, for example, the names of the four orders of friars (pp. 43 f. and 155), or the dates of epidemics of the Pestilence (pp. 47, 156, 161). The allotting of space to the various topics discussed shows a lack of proportion. It seems strange that four and a half pages should be devoted to the Pestilence when the literary revival of the fourteenth century is dismissed in a single page.

The section ends with a brief consideration of *Piers Plowman* itself, emphasizing the 'social and religious criticism found in the poem' and its provision of material 'illustrating the life and manners of the common people' in the poet's time (p. 54). This limited approach is unfortunate since, if one excepts a very

¹ *M.P.*, xii, 393.

² 'The Text of *Piers Plowman*: Critical Methods', *M.L.R.*, xi (1916), 271.

short summary of contents, this is the only general account given of the poem. Its allegorical structure and its literary value remain undiscussed, yet these are surely as important as the 'intimate glimpses of daily living' (p. 54) which it affords.

In the Explanatory Notes the editors fluctuate between pessimism and optimism. On the one hand, there is a tendency to point out what should be obvious. For example, the student is told that the description of the shriving of Mede 'contains a severe indictment of friars' (p. 158), and that the line

As ancris and ermytes that holdem hem in here sellis (Prologue, 28)

'refers to the good hermits, who stayed in their cells' (p. 154). On the other hand, he is apparently expected to take the whole of Passus II in his stride with no help except one comment on a verbal construction, one back-reference to the introductory account of the friars, and one indication of the source of a biblical quotation.

The editor of an unrhymed Middle English work is bound to be at a disadvantage when he attempts to consider the probable dialect of the original. The present editors rightly emphasize the importance of 'utilizing alliteration in dialect tests' when possible (p. 19), and they show the application of this principle in a discussion of those verbal and pronominal forms whose initial sounds vary in different dialects. Nevertheless, the section on dialect is brief, and students might profit by the addition of an account of the phonology and orthography of T, since this manuscript provides 'the basis for spelling and dialect' of the present edition (p. 28).

In conclusion, acknowledgement should be made of Dr. Fowler's care in handling the material which Knott left unprinted at the time of his death. The younger editor has had the task of harmonizing forty-year-old work with more recent studies of *Piers Plowman*. Dr. Fowler should also be commended for an excellent bibliography which covers work on all aspects of all three texts of the poem.

STELLA BROOK

The Latin Epigrams of Thomas More. Edited with Translations and Notes by LEICESTER BRADNER and CHARLES ARTHUR LYNCH. Pp. xlv+255. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Cambridge: University Press, 1953. \$7.50; 56s. 6d. net.

'England's greatest Lord Chancellor' was not a great poet, nor a very good metrist. But his Latin Epigrams have 'their obvious interest'. They 'are very little known today', and students interested in 'the golden age of English humanism' must be grateful to Professor Bradner and Professor Lynch for making them accessible and intelligible. So good and useful a book have they given us that I could not be better employed (I feel), reviewing it, than by listing a number of easily corrigible errors.

I will take first errors of translation:

Ep. 58. 2:

Qui rebus pluris se facit ipse suis:

'that makes itself of more account than its wealth' (*not*, as our Editors, 'which uses its own resources to improve itself').

Ep. 63. 4:

Illa breui est quae nos diuidet una duos.

'It is she only who will shortly separate us' (*not* 'In short, it is she, only she, who will keep us two apart').

Ep. 102. 1-2:

Non timor inuisus, non alta palatia regem,
Non compilata plebe tuentur opes:

'Not fear unseen, not towering palaces, not wealth won from a plundered people, protects a king' (*not* 'Fear (accompanied as it is by hatred) does not protect a king from a plundered people, nor do towering palaces and wealth').

Ep. 114. 7:

Fors tamen irridet quo tu laudante superbis:

'But perhaps the man whose praise makes you proud is mocking you' (*not* 'Yet chance mocks the man whose praise makes you proud'. This is not the only place where More uses *Fors* for *Forsitan*).

Ep. 182. 16:

Omni anno consul rex erit ergo nouus:

'In every year, therefore, the consul will be a new king' (*not* 'So it is that a consul—one who shares his power—will be at any time as good as a king is in the beginning of his reign').

Ep. 208. 15:

O regem fidum sed tunc tantummodo fidum:

'O King true to thy word, but true on this occasion only!' (*not* 'Here is a king who abides by his word, but his word is all that he has').

Ep. 226. 5-6:

Quaeue canas qualive modo contemnitis, ea est spes
Victura haec genio qualiacunque suo.

'You care nothing for the theme or style of your song, such hope have you that whatever you sing will live by its genius' (*not* 'Now the hope that writing of any kind will survive lies in the subject which you celebrate and in the principles by which you exclude some things—that is, in the power of the writing itself').

App. ii. 7. 1:

Moraris si sit spes (hic) tibi longa morandi:

'You are foolish if you entertain any long hope of remaining here on earth' (*not* 'you delay, in case your expectation of staying be extended'). More has plenty of false quantities, but *Moraris* here is not one of them. It is 2 sing. pres. indic. of *moror*, *morari*, 'to be foolish'. After *spes* I have inserted *hic*, which is demanded both by sense and metre.

More's false quantities gave pain—but some pleasure as well—to Brixius; who called attention, our Editors tell us, to sixteen of them (but when they come to list them, p. xxx, they table only fifteen). Errors which neither they nor Brixius note are: Ep. 16. 1, *facilē*; 28. 1, *Sosīme*; 71. 1 (and 127. 2), *Gŷgis*; 71. 15, *fāc*; 77. 4, *dirimant*; 237. 8 (and 249. 5), *rētulere*. In Ep. 71. 20, *Pulchro cum Dionysio*, sense and metre require *Dionysō*. But our Editors have a note: '*Dionysio*, though required by the meter, seems to be a mistake for *Dionysō*.'

In a good many places they have left standing, without comment, lines metrically faulty of which the faults seem due, not to More, but to the printer. Some of these are easily corrected.

Ep. 4. 9:

Aut lanceis icta ungulisue sonipedum:

The metre demands

Aut icta lanceis ungulisue sonipedum.

Ep. 189. 18:

Quibus laborque studiumque id est:

laborque should be corrected to *labor*.

Ep. 229. 12:

Tantum cum haberes, unum tamen viris:

For *unum* read *unicum*.

Ep. 231. 5:

Interque multa quaerit an unquam malos:

For *unquam* read *nunquam*.

App. ii. 3. 2:

Deliciis tuis pastus es Holtiade.

Sense and metre are given by

Deliciisque tuis pastus es, Holtiade.

(*Holtiade* is ablative, not genitive; *Holtiade Epigramma*, in the title to App. ii. 2, should probably be corrected to *Holtiadis Epigramma*; though More elsewhere plays odd tricks with the declension of proper names (as with the name *Herveus* in Epp. 170-9).)

Misprints of which the metre affords no indication, but the failure to detect which embarrasses translation and interpretation, are more numerous than they should be. In Ep. 29 our Editors print the last two lines so:

Muneris hoc nostri est, Venus inquit. Verba retorquens

Fortuna, haec nostri est muneris, inquit, hera:

rendering by 'Venus said, "This union is evidence of my favor." But Fortune, echoing her words, replied, "This wife is evidence of my favor."' In the last line there should be a comma after *haec*, and no comma after *Fortuna*; and we should translate: 'Venus said, "This is of my giving." Mistress Fortune, throwing back these words, said, "It is of my giving."' For *hera* as a title of the Goddess Fortuna, see Plautus, *Merc.* 598^a, 842, Ennius, *Ann.* 195.

Ep. 124. 3:

Hoc fecere fames, caedes, furor aeris, egestas.

aeris is a misprint—the printer's eye was caught by *aere* in the line preceding. Reference to the Greek which More is translating shows that he wrote:

Hoc fecere fames, caedes, furor, acris egestas.

Ep. 143. 5-6:

Non resonant isti versus, ait, illico sensi.

Qualeis lactucas talia labra petant.

Our Editors translate: 'He said, "Those verses of yours do not rhyme; I noticed it at once". Let such taste as his seek an appropriate dish.' This is to throw grammar and syntax to the winds. More wrote:

Non resonant isti versus, ait. Illico sensi

Qualeis lactucas talia labra petant:

which may be rendered: "These verses of yours do not rhyme", he said. I realized forthwith what kind of inferior food such lips as his like.'

App. ii. 3. 30:

Admonuit labris ubera chara meis:

Our Editors render: 'suggested a pap welcome to my lips.' This is not to stop and think. *Admonuit* is a mere misprint for *Admouit*.

Other misprints that I have noted are:

Progymnasmata, 10, Lillii 2, *accelerare* for *accelerare*; 15, Lillii 2, *Musarum* for *Musas*; 17, Lillii 1, *vita* for *viua*, 2, *vitam* for *viuam*; Ep. 52. 5, *uarii*, (for *uarii*); 76. 2, *finxerat* for *finxerit*; 77. 2, *natus*, (for *natus*); 115. 2, *bibit* (for *bibit*.); 121. 2, *pares*, (for *pares*.); 182. 24, *gravius* (for *gravius*.), 25 *rebus* (for *rebus*.); 198. 3, *aegre abstemius esse* (for *aegre*), *abstemius esse*; 231. 6, *crediderat* for *crediderit*; 233. 5, *tuto nam, si* for *tuto, nam si*; App. ii. 2. 10, *pauua* for *pauca*; App. ii. 3. 7, *Ac* for *At*.

On Ep. 137 our Editors have a note in their commentary and a note in section 4 of their Introduction. More is translating an Epigram of the Greek Anthology (*Anth. Pal.* xi. 201):

Ἀντιπάτραν γυμνὴν εἴ τις Πάρθοισιν εἰδείξεν,
ἔκτοθεν ἂν στηλῶν Ἡρακλέους ἔφυγον.

More's text has

Fugerit ad Parthos, vel ad Herculis usque columnas,
Visa semel, positus vestibus, Antipatra.

Our Editors suggest, very sensibly, that the Greek text which More had before him read, not *ἔφυγον*, but *ἔφυγεν*. This accounts for More's *Fugerit*, but does not account for *ad Parthos*. I cannot but think that what More wrote was *a Parthis*.

A notable inconvenience in this text of the Epigrams is the fact that there is no numbering of lines. Ep. 1 runs to 190 lines. The commentary has a note on line 179. But to locate the reference in the text the reader has to count

laboriously. The Index to the book is in some particulars, if not inconvenient, odd. Virgil, for example, must be looked for under *Maro*, Ovid under *Naso*. For Wolsey, you must go to *Eboracensis*; but you are helped to it by an entry 'Thomas (Wolsey); see Eboracensis'.

H. W. GARROD

Respublica: an interlude for Christmas 1553, attributed to Nicholas Udall. Re-edited by W. W. GREG (Early English Text Society, O.S. 226). Pp. xxi+83. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1952 (for 1946). 18s. 6d. net.

The appearance of a new edition of *Respublica* to replace the old ones is a welcome occasion. Sir Walter Greg has based his text ultimately on the colotype facsimile published in 1908 (the original MS. is in the U.S.A.), using also the editions of Brandl (1898) and Magnus (E.E.T.S., 1905). Footnotes to each page indicate the more important suggestions of these editors, and the MS. readings where emendations have been incorporated into the text (except at l. 612, where 'geare' silently replaces the MS. error 'yeare'); the only unrecorded emendations concern minor punctuation-signs, and the procedure followed is fully stated in the introduction. Sir Walter has provided an accurate text which can be used with confidence.

Although it must be by the reliability of its text that an edition stands or falls, one would have welcomed a longer introduction. Sir Walter devotes two-thirds of his fifteen-page essay to the question of authorship, adding further internal evidence in support of Magnus's attribution of *Respublica* to Udall, and showing that the surviving external evidence does not make this attribution unlikely. At times one feels that the strong case for Udall is being overstated: several verbal 'parallels' with Udall's known work are commonplaces (e.g. 'abusion', 'cockes bones', 'mome', 'paules steeple') and many dramatic features of *Respublica* are characteristic of other Tudor interludes besides *Roister Doister* (naïve conventions of entrance and exit, frequency of songs and of proverbs, use of rustic dialect). Nevertheless, the stylistic evidence is so heavily in Udall's favour that Sir Walter might profitably have pursued the problem of why Udall, whose known writings have a Protestant flavour, should have written this manifestly anti-Protestant work. Discussion of this might then have led to the critical appraisal of *Respublica* as a satire and as a play: it is undoubtedly, after *The Three Estates*, the liveliest and most pungent political interlude we have. Magnus adequately sketched the political background, but his notes are sparse and sometimes need correction (notably the fantastic assertion that in ll. 1290 ff. Mary Tudor and Jane Grey are figured as two rival Verities and Henry VIII as Old Time), and apart from supplying a colloquial marginal commentary (which Sir Walter wisely suppresses) he made no attempt to discuss the play as such. A fuller introduction to the present edition would have filled this gap.

The glossary, while largely accurate, at times reveals a surprising neglect of previous editors' findings. No mention is made of Magnus's notes on 'flettance' (l. 97), 'godsgood' (l. 1028), or 'Iustitia tamen non luxit in nobis' (l. 1530), though we do find his curious guess that 'pitcheree' (l. 1740) means 'begging with

a pitcher (a northern custom): surely 'pitcheree, patcherie' and 'snatcherie, catcherie' in the following line have the function of compounds, and can no more be glossed separately than can 'higgledy' and 'piggledy'? J. S. Farmer's modernized collections of Tudor interludes do not seem to have been consulted at all; a bad oversight, since the notes often compensate for the ugly form and textual uselessness of those squat volumes. His suggestion for 'fichaunt' (l. 1821: People's error for 'sufficient', i.e. 'esteemed'—*'Lost' Tudor Plays with some others*, 1907, p. 398) seems preferable to Greg's 'fitchant' (*O.E.D.* first in 1600), nimble'. By two contemporary dramatic illustrations he shows that 'have att thye petticote' (l. 1892) does not convey 'the idea of stripping' (Greg) but that of beating or punishment (*L.T.P.*, p. 448, and references). To 'leape at a daisie' (l. 1322), for which Greg conjectures 'to lie under the sod, to turn up one's toes', is shown to mean 'to be hanged' (*L.T.P.*, p. 391, with reference to his *Anonymous Plays*, 3rd series, pp. 261-2, where an illustration clinches the point by showing the phrase's origin); the meaning 'be hanged' also occurs in Magnus's notes. People's 'they bade me pieke me home' (l. 1591: Greg, '? pick my way home') is explained, with two illustrations, as 'walk, be off, get home' (*L.T.P.*, p. 449), and Palsgrave's dictionary (1530: fol. 316) shows that Farmer is again right: 'Come of pycke you hence and your heles hytherwarde: Sys tyre auant tyre des tallons'. For 'beare faire in hand[e]' and its past participle (ll. 680, 941, 969) Greg confidently gives 'to deal courteously with', and 'treated, managed, governed'; but in Palsgrave (fol. 162^v) we have 'I Beare in hande I threp vpon a man y^t he hath done a dede / or make hym byleue so / Ie fais accroyre'. The phrase's main meaning is 'persuade' (with a strong suggestion of 'deceive'), and in *Respublica* it surely means 'to give plausible explanations'. There is an unhappy conjecture regarding Adulation's 'A pestell on hym, he comes of the Acyons', uttered in trying to remember Oppression's false name of Reformation ('?Asians, Asiatics, 409'): in fact the speaker thinks that 'Acyon' is a surname and that 'Reform', 'Deform', &c., are Christian names. Sir Walter has, however, the excellent suggestion that 'best be truste' (l. 343) should be 'best betruste' (i.e. best trusted)—both Magnus and Farmer are far wide—and he makes good textual emendations at ll. 1217, 1220, 1445, 1634, and 1646 (his emendations at ll. 1625, 1637, and 1744 are anticipated by Farmer). The present reviewer's suggestion for the damaged line 1714 ('yet ye drinke nowe and than your owne selfe on the whippe') has appeared in *Notes and Queries* (July 1953) since the publication of Sir Walter's edition.

To sum up, this edition contains a finely edited text of this fine play, but the grateful reader will be a little disappointed by the brevity of the introduction and by the editor's exclusive reliance on the *O.E.D.* while 'fully aware' of its shortcomings (p. xiii, note).

T. W. CRAIK

Shakespeare Survey 6. Edited by ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Pp. viii+185. Cambridge: University Press, 1953. 18s. net.

The *Survey* has now reached its sixth number, and it has probably never had

a hostile review. This immunity is a result of merit, but it should not become a matter of habit; and although this number seems to be as good on the whole as most of its predecessors, I propose to begin with some complaints.

The first is about the international character of the work. This is a delicate subject, but generally speaking it is well known that the anxious desire to please often makes a meeting between people of different nationalities grotesquely tedious and unnatural; and internationalism prosecuted for its own sake is a provincialism. In particular, the section of the *Survey* which deals with Shakespearean activities all over the world reads like a parish magazine, or notes from old scholars, and it would be more international to leave it out altogether. Furthermore, it may not be as unmannerly as it is necessary to say that some contributions from foreign scholars are frankly out of their class in *Shakespeare Survey*. Almost every year the first article is a work of mature scholarship and permanent value, and it is a killing kindness to bind up with it the rootless fancies and flat banalities of less fortunate authors. This criticism does not apply to expert contributions like that of Mr. Chang Chen-Hsien in the present number, on translating Shakespeare into Chinese. It does, however, apply to other items which are foreign only in the sense that the writers are clearly not at home in the *Survey*.

In fact, contrary to the general impression, it seems obvious that nowadays it is only the scholar who can talk about Shakespeare without slipping into some cant or other; not, of course, that he is immune, but he has a degree of familiarity which prevents hollow bardolatry, a reputation which precludes pretentiousness and irresponsibility, and a training which makes him a lucid expositor. The inclusion of articles which are evidently not from such a hand tends to detract from the authority of the *Survey*, and possibly repels the general reader, for whom the series is supposed to have interest; he will venture into this difficult terrain only if he has confidence in his guide, and can be sure he is not being trifled with.

In short, there is some need for a change in the *Survey* before it becomes too venerable to be questioned without the risk of committal for contempt. The rector should not put the royal visit and the jumble-sale into the same paragraph.

The sixth number is, of course, very good. The main topic is the history plays, and Dr. Harold Jenkins's historical account of twentieth-century criticism of them ranks with the best work that has appeared in the series. A later account of the same subject will certainly need to record with respect Dr. Clifford Leech's paper on *2 Henry IV*. Dr. Leech is, as he has earlier hinted, sceptical about the modern practice of treating the histories schematically, and he is here both subtle and impressive. In the other major article of this group Professor Kenneth Muir reconsiders the authorship of *Edward III*, and supports Alfred Hart's claim for Shakespeare (which was based on very elaborate vocabulary tests) with other kinds of evidence, chiefly from imagery.

The series of papers on great Shakespeare libraries continues, this year with Mr. Godfrey Davis on the Huntington. This will startle the untravelled English, as the great American libraries always do. There is a photograph of it, the tycoon library of the new world, white and rich in the sunlight of academic California. The illustrated commentary on recent productions is another regular and pleasant

feature. This time Mr. Richard David went to Stratford for the Festival history cycle, of which he gives a generous, critical, and detailed account. Mr. George Rylands deals elegantly but acutely with the West End Festival productions, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *The Winter's Tale*, to both of which, and especially the first, he seems much too kind; though this is again out of generosity, not thickness of sight. Finally there is the survey of the previous year's work, with Miss M. C. Bradbrook very vivacious on Critical Studies, and Dr. Leech and Dr. McManaway on the Life, Times, and Stage, and Textual Studies. Dr. McManaway, with more space than the others, gives very useful critiques of his more important items, and singles out for close attention the excellent paper on *Pericles* which Mr. Philip Edwards contributed to the fifth number of the *Survey*.

Of the non-recurring articles, there is one of self-evident importance—Professor C. T. Prouty's illustrated account of drama in Trinity Hall in the 50s and 60s of the sixteenth century. Mrs. Joan Rees suspects that Daniel incorporated some visual memories of the *Antony and Cleopatra* monument scene in his revision of *Cleopatra*. Mr. Terence Spencer argues that some muddle about the value of a talent in *Timon* can be used to support the theory that the play as it stands is only an unfinished draft. This is a good argument, except that there seems to be no difficulty about the line 'He cannot want fifty five hundred Talents', where *fifty* and *five hundred* need not be regarded as alternatives of which one was to be struck out; insert a comma after *fifty* and the line means: 'I don't believe Timon can be short of fifty, or for that matter five hundred, talents.' Mr. J. W. Lever has a gay paper on John Eliot, author of *Ortho-Epia*, and establishes contact between that work and the language of Pistol and the Dauphin, but not that of Juliet.

There is no criticism of the interpretative kind, except Dr. Leech's, that is worth mentioning; and room could, as I have hinted, be made for it. However, next year's leading theme is to be Style and Language, which must surely offer an occasion to repair the omission.

FRANK KERMODE

The Honest Mans Fortune. A Critical Edition of MS. Dyce 9 (1625).

Edited by J. GERRITSEN. Pp. cxi+188 (Groningen Studies in English, III). Groningen and Djakarta: J. B. Wolters, 1952. Fl. 12.90.

The Honest Mans Fortune was printed in the First Beaumont and Fletcher Folio and exists also in a Dyce Collection manuscript, which describes the play as 'Plaide In the yeare 1613' and concludes with a licence from Herbert dated 8 February 1624(-5). According to Herbert the play was 'an olde One and the Originall Lost'. The actor-list in the Second Folio suggests that 'the original performers were Lady Elizabeth's men, after the Queen's Revels had joined them in March 1613' (*The Elizabethan Stage*, iii. 227). The performance planned in 1625 was to be given by the King's Men. The Folio contains a scene not in the manuscript, and the two texts differ in a short passage at the end. The manuscript is in the hand of Edward Knight, book-keeper to the King's Men, whose signature has been found by Dr. Gerritsen on the Articles of Agreement between Alleyn and Jacob Meade and certain players, dated 20 March 1615/16.

Dr. Gerritsen's edition is based on the manuscript: he has recourse to the Folio or to conjecture only when the manuscript readings prove unacceptable. Folio readings are, however, fully recorded. The manuscript has been printed with great care, even to the typographical indication of different types of handwriting and to the preservation of the placing of speech-headings. Mislineation is frequent in both texts, and Dr. Gerritsen has attempted to restore the line-arrangements that the play's authors intended. We are indebted to him for making the manuscript version more easily available, and for his thorough consideration of provenance and authorship.

It has been generally agreed (e.g. by W. W. Greg, *Dramatic Documents*, p. 290; R. C. Bald, *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647*, p. 57) that the two texts have an immediate common source. Sir Walter Greg and Professor Bald have taken the view that this was 'some sort of stage version' that 'came into the hands of the King's Men from Lady Elizabeth's company'. They have contrasted Knight's manuscript with the manuscript version of *Bonduca*, confessedly a transcript of foul papers which occasioned the scribe much difficulty: Knight's text has, in comparison, a high degree of accuracy. But this theory not only postulates the existence of an intermediate manuscript (a transcript of the 1613 prompt-book) but assumes it was 'too worn or untidy to submit to Herbert'. Dr. Gerritsen points out that, as a transcript of an official prompt-book, this would not be expected to contain the cut passages found in Knight's manuscript, and he wonders also how it came about that such a transcript was ever made. While he agrees that the two texts have a common source (and indeed produces much evidence in support of this view), he is inclined to believe that that source was the foul papers of the authors. His strongest evidence for this may be briefly given: (1) the Folio reading 'my Lady *Annabella*' at II. ii. 107, where the manuscript correctly reads 'my ladye *Lamira*', seems a slip due to multiple authorship, which would be corrected in a prompt-book; (2) at IV. ii. 155 Knight deletes the words 'the burden of his', which would continue the sense of I. 154, and replaces them with the beginning of a quite different line: it looks as if the deleted words stood in Knight's copy and that the author had rejected them in the process of composition. Dr. Gerritsen does not claim that this evidence compels belief, but he has at least raised a strong doubt whether *The Honest Mans Fortune* is not, after all, based like *Bonduca* on foul papers: that it is a better text may mean only that the papers were in a better condition.

In discussing the authorship of the play, Dr. Gerritsen explores ground already heavily and roughly traversed. He perhaps attaches too much importance to the presentation of Lapoop as a sea-captain in some scenes and a land-captain in others: Lapoop's claims to any kind of service are doubtful, and an author might not imagine them consistently. But there is the Folio's reading of '*Annabella*' noted above, there is the verse of the comic characters in Act V in contrast to their previously normal prose, there are the frequent Folio spellings 'yf' and 'yt' in Act I only. Assuming, therefore, that the play is of multiple authorship (which from its highly varied atmosphere seems likely), Dr. Gerritsen has applied a verse-test (the ratio of double endings to 'inversions') and Dr. Partridge's 'grammatical' test, and has briefly commented on other methods. His most interesting

result is the assigning of Act I and Act II, Scene i, to Tournear. He is confident that Act IV is Field's and Act V Fletcher's, but is not convinced that the claims of other dramatists can be established.

CLIFFORD LEECH

Poems of Michael Drayton. Edited by JOHN BUXTON. Vol. I, pp. xliii + 306; Vol. II, pp. v + 307-724 (The Muses' Library). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953. 30s. net.

Despite the title, this is, of course, a selection, comprising something like a fifth of the poet's output. But it is a larger selection than has ever been published before except in the collections of Chalmers and Anderson (in which Wordsworth and Coleridge read their Drayton); and in one important respect it supplements, even improves upon, that earlier selection which readers of this journal are most likely to have on their own shelves, in a now-very-much-off-white binding—the Clarendon Press *Drayton's Minor Poems*, edited by Cyril Brett. The new selection finds room for a substantial sample of the 'major' poems, and thus represents Drayton as a narrative and heroic as well as a lyric and pastoral poet. This was worth doing, even though many of the sonnets and odes given by Brett had to be sacrificed.

The main part of Mr. Buxton's editorial task must have been the making of this selection, and his choice is highly commendable. He gives nearly a third of the sonnets and odes, about half of the 1606 pastorals and the 1627 elegies, four of the twelve pairs of *Heroicall Epistles*, one of the four *Legends*, and eleven of the thirty 'songs' of *Poly-Olbion*; and he gives complete *Endimion and Phoebe*, *The Owle*, *Nimphidia*, *Shepherds Sirena*, the *Muses Elizium*, and—with justifiable courage—the *Barons Warres*. There are thus examples of all the literary kinds in which Drayton worked, except the 'divine poem', and each kind, save possibly satire, has its due proportion. One might wish for more of what Drayton actually wrote in Elizabeth's reign, but the preference of revised over early versions is defensible.

The editor has not unnaturally economized space by omitting all preliminary matter to the poems (Drayton's prefaces and dedications, and the commendatory verses) and by giving hardly any textual variants. The fact of revision is, however, indicated (if sometimes too briefly for accuracy, as when *Idea*, 1619, is called his 'final recension' of *Ideas Mirrour*, 1594) and the dedicatees are named in the notes. As a whole the editorial notes seem rather meagre, especially on the *Barons Warres*, where they consist almost entirely of Drayton's own glosses; and no very clear principle of inclusion and omission is apparent. (Mr. Buxton quotes Johnson on 'necessary evils', and also 'I could have written longer notes, for the art of writing notes is not of difficult attainment'.) Attention must be drawn to the important new material on pp. 292-4, from a recently discovered contemporarily annotated copy of *The Owle*, in the collection of Dr. Juel-Jensen; and also to p. xvii of the Introduction, for a new fact about the 'Apollo room'. On p. 297 my own dating of one of the Elegies is queried; the difficulty about the ships'

return
still so
The
policy
but su
the or
Ashm
his po
reason
of Dr
mirac
another
Baron
quent
unple
text.
from a
Macdo
The
reader
convey
centur
spoke
whole
Shakes
of prin
presen
expens

The W
Earl
Stap
The
may su
Ramus
back as
nomin
sophy
develop
expect
this par
Mr. Ba
Hardin
method

return is a real one, as I saw (but evidently did not state clearly enough), but 1622 still seems the most probable year.

The text appears from a sample checking to be verbally accurate. No editorial policy in such matters as spelling, punctuation, capitals, and italics is announced; but such a policy can be inferred. While keeping the spelling and punctuation of the originals (save in a few cases, mostly noted—an exception is the lines from Ashmole MS. 38) the editor has considered the capitals and italics as wholly in his power. The loss of the capitals is to be regretted, and not for merely pedantic reasons. When, for example, Love, Passion, Faith, and Innocence in the sestet of Drayton's greatest sonnet lose their status as personifications, part of the miraculous modulation in that sonnet is lost upon the modern reader. There is another small inconsistency: line-references are given for all poems except the *Barons Warres*, which has numbered stanzas; and partly as a result of the consequent spacing, some of the page-openings for this poem have an irregular and unpleasing appearance, an exception to the generally attractive appearance of the text. A few words are editorially glossed; one such gloss should be corrected from an article in this journal (xxi, 1945, pp. 127-33), in which Mrs. Charlotte Macdonald convincingly identified the mysterious 'tydie' with the Great Tit.

The Introduction, sound and pleasing if unexciting, is written for the general reader rather than the specialist; it will rarely mislead, and it has the merit of conveying a warm and comprehensive admiration of Drayton's poetry. Half a century ago Elton, looking back to two earlier revivals of interest in Drayton, spoke of a 'third revival' then becoming apparent, and the hope that Drayton's whole works might be made accessible. By 1941 that hope was fulfilled in the *Shakespeare Head Drayton*, of which Mr. Buxton speaks gratefully; it is now out of print, and the time is ripe for a fourth and more widespread revival which the present selection may well initiate. A halfpenny a page for the text alone is not expensive.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

The War of Truth: Studies in the Decay of Christian Humanism in the Earlier Seventeenth Century. By HERSCHEL BAKER. Pp. xii+390. London: Staples Press, 1952. 35s. net.

The field covered by Mr. Baker's book is more extensive than even its sub-title may suggest: it stretches backwards beyond the limits of his period to include Ramus, Montaigne, and the Neo-Stoicism of the sixteenth century, even so far back as to include a brief sketch of St. Thomas Aquinas's rationalism and the nominalism of William of Ockham; it ranges forwards through the 'new philosophy' to Hobbes and Sprat. Mr. Baker has previously written a study of the development of Christian humanism; now he describes its eclipse. It is to be expected that a book which comes in the wake of twenty years of scholarship in this particular field of the history of ideas will only retrace familiar ground, and Mr. Baker admits that he leans heavily on earlier surveys like those of Professors Hardin Craig and Willey. He is aware, too, of the limitations of his synoptic method. The book tends to be divisible into summaries of the ideas of individual

thinkers or groups of thinkers, and these summaries are freely illustrated by quotations; instead of a single line of thought selecting from and disciplining the material, there is a surrender to the rich confusion of the intellectual warfare which is the author's subject.

Because of this comprehensiveness and the absence of a strongly marked personal point of view, these studies have the peculiar value of reflecting the revolution in historiography which has taken place in the last quarter of a century. The frontier between the medieval and the modern mind has been pushed forward from the time of the revival of learning to the middle of the seventeenth century. The decisive change is seen to have taken place, not during the Renaissance, not even with the break-up of Christendom and the emergence of national states, but with the collapse of belief in an order primarily spiritual at both the cosmological and the human level, and the substitution for it of a thoroughgoing secularist attitude. As Mr. Baker says: 'The traditional notions central to Renaissance thought retained their vitality far into the seventeenth century' (p. 363). Milton was 'the last great exemplar of Renaissance humanism'. But long before then the uneasiness of the synthesis between humanistic rationalism and the sacramental view of nature had become increasingly apparent. We can see the end of the great debate in the pathetic attacks of the conservatives Méric Casaubon and Henry Stubbe on the virtuosos of the Royal Society.

The book throws into relief, too, the general problems associated with the technique of inquiry known as history of ideas. The business of the historian of ideas is with 'the assumptions felt as facts which underlie systems' (p. 95) and their evolution and decay. But he is an historian, not a philosophical critic; his role appears to be that of a man without presuppositions who is concerned with the presuppositions of other people. Judgement of value is excluded and the currency of an idea alone, in a sufficient number of books, entitles it to consideration. Hakewill and Godfrey Goodman get as much space as Hooker and Bacon. The result is that intellectual concepts are criticized, not on their own merits, but in terms of fashion and the changing needs of society; and yet they remain abstractions, and the exponent of this method is prevented by the limits of his discipline from studying their embodiment in institutions except in a curiously bloodless way. Thus Mr. Baker speaks of Puritanism and Anglicanism as 'those configurations of religious emotion' (p. 187). Puritan and Anglican do, of course, present two different types of the religious mind, but to speak of them like this is to ignore the political and ecclesiastical factors which helped to bring the two movements into being and into eventual conflict.

The same search for abstractions is often least happily applied to narrative or dramatic literature, where ideas cannot be considered apart from the intention of the writer. Except in his second chapter on 'Death and Time', where he draws heavily on the Jacobean 'literature of disenchantment', Mr. Baker is restrained in his use of illustrations from imaginative literature. His statement that Tourneur's *Charlemont* is 'the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Stoic hero' is perhaps more acceptable than the view once put forward in the pages of this journal by Mr. Michael Higgins that *Charlemont* is a type of Calvinistic piety; but both claims show the Procrustean dangers of such a method when it is applied to poetry.

The
to w
expr
univ
Plato
Th
the a
in his
a typ
grace
about
tion f
Progr
subtle
gethe
In
the co
admin
closely
perhap
Attack
The
analys
used t
Societ
(p. 28)
many
Ramis
of the
Christi
glib ov

The G
Thou
Univ
The
well-kn
ones wh
was mu
of Parli
with th
shows h
by this
architec

The interpretation of Nature's 'doome' in the 'Mutabilitie' Cantos seems, again, to wrench the text to accommodate a theory. Canto VII, stanza lviii is said to express a vague and not very confident hope for the existence of order in the universe; the phrasing, however, suggests that Spenser was asserting in Neo-Platonic terms the unchanging being behind appearances.

There are other places where the encyclopaedic nature of his task has caused the author, intent on developing his general argument, to overlook some points in his analysis and comparison of particular writers. Bunyan's Talkative is not a type of the Puritan intellectualist who minimizes the irrational character of grace; Talkative claims to have a sense of sin and new birth, but he only talks about them, without exhibiting signs of regeneration. Similarly, to use a quotation from the lyrically eloquent final section of the Second Part of *The Pilgrim's Progress* to illustrate the new simplicity of Restoration prose is quite to miss the subtle and restrained use of rhythm by Bunyan, which makes this passage altogether unlike the plain style of, say, Dryden's prefaces.

In the fifth and sixth chapters the author narrows his stage, and recapitulates the controversy on liberty of conscience in the Civil War period, already so admirably surveyed by Haller and Woodhouse. This part of the book is not closely related to its main theme and forms a hiatus in the argument; it would perhaps have been better to follow straight on from the fourth chapter on 'The Attack on Authority' to the final one on the scientific revolution.

The substitution of a dramatic pattern of conflicting systems for independent analysis often has a vicious effect on the style; violently dynamic metaphors are used to describe the influence of abstractions. One wonders what the Royal Society's committee on language would have thought of the verbs 'channelize' (p. 28) and 'spearhead' (p. 256). However, a praiseworthy attempt is made in many places to understand ideas in their historical context. The discussion of Ramism is especially helpful; so is that of covenant theology. Above all, a sense of the extraordinarily varied and often contradictory character of the heritage of Christian humanism, though it does not always make for clarity, does prevent glib over-simplification.

ROGER SHARROCK

The Goths in England: A Study in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Thought. By SAMUEL KLIGER. Pp. viii+304. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1952. \$5.00; 32s. 6d. net.

The purpose of this book, stated briefly, is to supplement the comparatively well-known eighteenth-century associations of 'Gothic' with less well-known ones which take us back into seventeenth-century political thought. The word was much used, the author claims, by propagandists defending the prerogatives of Parliament, our Germanic forebears being credited with a love of liberty and with the creation of institutions from which Parliament developed. Then he shows how, at a later date, a Whiggish emphasis on popular liberties, supported by this view of the Teutonic past, could become linked with a Gothic taste in architecture. An anonymous essayist of 1739 writes of Gothic buildings:

... I entered them with a Constitutional Sort of Reverence and look'd upon those arms with Gratitude, as the Terror of former Ministers and the Check of Kings. ... Our old Gothick Constitution had a noble strength and Simplicity in it, which was well enough represented by the bold Arches and the solid Pillars of the Edifices of those Days.

This, Mr. Kliger argues, was the 'Whig taste in the fine arts', while 'the symmetry and balance of the Grecian building apotheosized the Tory aim of maintaining national stability through a vested aristocratic interest and a strong monarchy'. The same writer in another place¹ has developed the correlation, touched upon by some eighteenth-century theorists, between parliamentary freedom and freedom in landscape design.

A large part of Mr. Kliger's book is devoted to the investigation of the Gothic tradition before the eighteenth century and in its non-aesthetic aspects. This involves excursions into varied fields of learning. His explanation of how the word came to be used of the Germanic peoples in general and therefore of the colonizers of England; his account of the doctrine, revived by Reformation leaders, of the *translatio imperii ad Teutonicos*, with its stress on Germanic virtues and Roman decadence; and his lengthy treatment of the use, by political writers of the seventeenth century, of material concerning the Germanic past drawn from Tacitus and from antiquarians such as Verstegen, Camden, Horn, and others: all these call for the attention of a variety of specialists. But a protest may be raised here against his repetitive insistence on the word 'Gothic' in his chapter on the political writers. The chapter is headed 'Gothic Parliaments', Verstegen is 'the ancestor of the Gothicists', reference is made to 'Gothic party pamphlets', 'Gothic propaganda', and 'Gothic arguments'; yet most of the writers referred to use words like 'Saxon' or 'German' in the passages cited, and the evidence offered for the extensive use of 'Gothic' before the closing years of the century (Harrington's 'Gothic balance' is one of a few significant examples given) is rather slender.

In establishing Gothic liberty as one of the commonplaces of the Augustan period, Mr. Kliger has achieved something; but his single-minded pursuit of his theme often leads to an insensitive treatment of individual writers, to an exaggeration or distortion of their role as exponents of this idea. While Sir William Temple's remarks on the Goths deserve the emphasis Mr. Kliger gives them (Temple was a popularizer of the tradition, and an important source for later writers on this topic), who would have thought, from Mr. Kliger's account of his 'Gothic evangelism', that Temple, in the essay 'Of Heroick Virtue', gives a comparable amount of space to other cultures, that the chapter dealing with the Goths is not the culminating one, and that it has been said of him by an authority² that he was the first political writer to hold up the Chinese system of government as a model? Similarly, one would like to have seen Swift's scattered remarks in praise of Gothic parliaments related to his thought as a whole. Mr. Kliger does not attempt to discuss all aspects of the eighteenth-century Gothic vogue, confining himself mainly to passages in which the word is associated with certain

¹ *E.L.H.*, xvi (1949), 135-50.

² H. E. Woodbridge, *Sir William Temple* (New York, 1940), p. 276.

adm
citer
'WH
Sto
bon
the
glow
avoi
his t
it as
with
The
the v
conv
usual
Mr. f

His fa
period
admits
majori
someti
of his
The
and ot

Pope's
Holo
ture
Univ
Acco
that is
twenty-
In Dec
friends
Lansdo
was des

admirable racial characteristics, including the love of liberty; though he also cites Tory writers who use it in a pejorative sense. Some interesting examples of 'Whig taste' are quoted, chiefly from topographical poems like Gilbert West's *Stowe*, where the idea of liberty is related to Gothic buildings. Edward Lovibond's *On Rebuilding Combe Neville* contains an address to 'thy Gothic tower', the poem continuing with 'There patriot passions fir'd my breast With freedom's glowing themes'. But perhaps too much is made of a few examples. Mr. Kliger's avoidance of all aspects but the chosen one sometimes leads to strange results, as his treatment of Thomson's *Liberty* rather disconcertingly shows. He describes it as 'the outstanding poem in the period on Gothic freedom', supporting his view with comments on several passages (iii. 539-40, iv. 370-4, 689-95, 798, 801-3). The passages are convincing enough, but what one cannot help noticing is that the word 'Gothic' does not occur in them (its use in 'Gothic states' in iv. 806 conveys no attitude) and that it does occur several times elsewhere in the poem, usually in the more well-known unfavourable sense, in passages with which Mr. Kliger is not concerned:

Such thy sure rules, that Goths of every age,
Who scorned thy aid, have only loaded earth
With laboured heavy monuments of shame. (ii. 378-80)

And mixed with Gothic forms, (the chisel's shame). . . (iii. 510)

Wait till the morning shines, and from the depth
Of Gothic darkness springs another day. (iv. 13-14)

His failure to relate his selected aspect of Gothic with others current at this period is the major weakness of the book. In the opening pages he very sensibly admits that the Whig-Gothic alignment does not always, or even perhaps in a majority of cases, hold good: Addison disliked Gothic architecture, and Whigs sometimes used the epithet in attacking Tories. But his recognition of the limits of his thesis does not prevent him from exaggerating it later.

The last chapter deals briefly with the speculations of Hurd, Percy, Warton, and others concerning the origins of the 'Gothic' romances.

D. W. JEFFERSON

Pope's *Windsor Forest* 1712: A Study of the Washington University Holograph. (Washington University Studies, N.S., Language and Literature XXI). Pp. iv+70. By ROBERT M. SCHMITZ. Saint Louis: Washington University, 1952. \$4.50.

According to Pope *Windsor Forest* was first composed when he was sixteen, that is in 1704. We know that he revised and reshaped it in 1712, when he was twenty-four. No manuscript or any printed form of the 1704 version survives. In December 1712 Pope submitted to the judgement and advice of a group of friends the manuscript of a longer version, dedicated to George Granville, Lord Lansdowne. In its earlier form, an imitation of Denham's *Cooper's Hill*, the poem was designed as a rural scene. The new poem, published 7 March 1713, was

chiefly distinguished from the old by a lengthy extension celebrating the forthcoming Peace of Utrecht, an achievement of the Tory administration. In 1736 Pope, publishing his *Works* with 'Explanatory Notes and Additions', invited the reader to believe that the new poem was the old poem with comparatively few variations and 136 new lines at the end. This was by no means an adequate account of what had really happened; and later editors have only in part presented the true story.

We have the advantage, however, that an elegantly written autograph of the poem, submitted by Pope to friends, as noted above, has survived. In the handsome quarto volume before us a facsimile of the manuscript, beautifully reproduced page by page, and almost in full size, appears, presenting the original with an extraordinary faithfulness to colour and tone. Opposite each facsimile page is printed the text of *Windsor Forest* as Pope circulated it to his friends. Variants from this text are considered in notes. Thus, as Professor Schmitz declares, with the 'manuscript before us we are no longer wholly dependent upon what Pope and his editors have chosen to tell us about *Windsor Forest* in transition'. By noting changes written into the manuscript by Pope, by following alterations through successive printings, it is the design of Professor Schmitz to further a better understanding of the poet as an 'architect and builder' in verse during the formative years and through his later development.

The history of the 1712 manuscript is of peculiar interest. It was not used for the published text of 1713. The printer, as variants show, must have been supplied with a fair copy. For over twenty years thereafter Pope appears to have made no further use of the 1712 manuscript, if we are to judge by the few variants appearing in printed texts between 1713 and 1736. Then, when he turned to note textual variants, the 1712 manuscript came into use again. Together with other manuscripts Pope, before his death, presented it to Jonathan Richardson, the younger. From Richardson the manuscript of *Windsor Forest* passed into the ownership of Charles Chauncey and his heirs, from whom Elwin borrowed it when engaged upon his edition of Pope's *Works*, where the poem appears in volume i, 1871. The manuscript then passed by sale through four or five hands till it reached William K. Bixby, who presented it in 1925 to Washington University. It will thus be noted that more than a century passed between Warburton's editorial use (1751) of the manuscript and that of Elwin, and again the best part of a century until studied in the minute detail which Professor Schmitz has devoted to it. Professor Schmitz shows what inadequate use Warburton made of the manuscript; and Elwin's textual notes did not really supplement Warburton. It should, in passing, be observed that the volume of the Twickenham Edition of Pope's poems destined to include *Windsor Forest* has not yet been published.

There are well over 100 major and minor changes shown in the 1712 manuscript. Neither Warburton nor Elwin appreciated the complexity of Pope's reconstruction. In his full and careful analysis of the poet's design directed to perfecting expression and improving versification Professor Schmitz takes into account readings from the manuscript, from printed editions between 1713 and 1751, and Pope's own notes. In considering the process of revision through which the poem passed Professor Schmitz begins by extracting from Pope's well-known

lette
Who
form
and
lette
part
rewr
it in
but
pres
the
lette
Po
know
'fully
well
fesso
find,
to se
stage
Th
comm
perfe

Davi
by
qvi
Hum
Pro
It i
tion t
litera
James
Hum
refute
wood
book
cism'
no inc
theori
to be
Unfor
theori

letter to Walsh of 22 October 1706 the seven guiding rules he enunciated. Whether this letter, with its orderly statement of rules, was ever, in its printed form, sent to Walsh may be doubted. Pope had few letters to Walsh to print, and may naturally, therefore, have been anxious to make the best of the last letter addressed to him. We know also that, when printing it, he omitted the last part of a letter to Cromwell written over four years later, 25 November 1710, and, rewriting *that* part, which also concerned itself with the seven rules, embodied it in the Walsh letter. Professor Schmitz refers by date to the Cromwell letter, but without comment. It may be that the quoted rules were not, in exact form, present to Pope's mind as early as 1706. It is, of course, to be recognized that the revised version of *Windsor Forest*, in any event, came later than the second letter.

Pope's constant and meticulous revision of his poems throughout life is well known. 'Of the 386 lines of the 1712 manuscript of *Windsor Forest*', we are told, 'fully half underwent some major or minor alteration.' Much that is of value, as well as many points of lesser interest, will be gained by a close study of Professor Schmitz's illuminating analysis. Confining ourselves to this one poem we find, for example, that of the first six rules (the seventh is the adaptation of sound to sense) only one remains unbroken. We trace, further, how Pope advanced by stages to a larger command of composition in verse paragraphs.

This handsome example of book production is distinguished by scholarly commentary and an apt arrangement of matter illustrating Pope's pursuit of perfection in the choice of words and the art of placing them in the right order.

HAROLD WILLIAMS

David Hume on Criticism. By TEDDY BRUNIUS. Pp. 137 (Figura: 2. Studies by the Institute of Art History, University of Uppsala). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1952. Sw. Kr. 24.

Hume's Intentions. By J. A. PASSMORE. Pp. ix+167. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. 18s. net.

It is perhaps infrequent for a writer to be better understood by his own generation than by later generations, but this certainly seems true of David Hume as a literary critic. Bishop Hurd, Lord Kames, Alexander Gerard, George Campbell, James Beattie, Hugh Blair, George Walker, among many others considered Hume's theories valuable enough to be followed or significant enough to be refuted. But modern philosophers, with few exceptions (e.g. Cassirer and Collingwood), have not shared this interest in Hume's literary theories. Mr. Passmore's book is, in this respect, consistent with the tradition. He recognizes that 'criticism' belongs to Hume's major interest in 'moral subjects', but he undertakes no inquiry into it. Since this review is confined to an analysis of Hume's literary theories, it can merely indicate that Passmore finds 'Hume's great achievement' to be a 'conception of science, in which speculation, not security, is the key-note'. Unfortunately, Passmore neglects the role of speculation in Hume's aesthetic theories.

It is, therefore, to Teddy Brunius's volume that one must turn for the first comprehensive study of Hume's 'criticism'. *David Hume on Criticism* is primarily an historical work, attempting to place Hume's aesthetics in 'chronological sequence' and relate it to Hume's philosophy and practical judgements. But these purposes are somewhat ambitious for this limited study, just as the identification of Hume's term 'criticism' with 'what is now called esthetics' is much broader than either Hume or eighteenth-century usage warrants. The study deals with Hume's concept of imagination and his analysis of beauty, tragedy, and taste. References to these subjects are scattered throughout the *Treatise*, *Essays*, and *History*, but Brunius summarizes rather than synthesizes them. Thus the study—with the exception of essays on tragedy and taste—retains some of the disorder of Hume's own presentation.

Brunius succeeds in giving an historical context for Hume's ideas on tragedy, referring to Du Bos, Fontenelle, Burke, Hurd, Blair, and Campbell. He finds Hume's contribution to the discussion to be an associationist analysis of catharsis. But in treating Hume's theories of imagination, beauty, sympathy, and taste, Brunius neglects the historical situation and is often at a loss in assessing either Hume's contribution or his influence. Hume's theory of imagination identifies poetry with lying and irregular fancy as well as with truth and the understanding. Brunius concludes from the first view that in the 'English esthetic debate from the time of Hume on, one can trace a continuous tradition hostile to poetry'. But Hume is neither the initiator nor the central figure in English hostility to poetry. Henry More, Hobbes, and innumerable writers before and after them on the evils of the drama emphasize this Platonic view of poetry. So, too, the unhistorical approach to Hume's theory of beauty makes it difficult to grasp Hume's revision of the views of Hutcheson and the classical rhetoricians.

The second task which Brunius sets himself—the relation of Hume's aesthetics to his philosophy as a whole—presupposes a definition of what Hume's philosophy is. Brunius selects as the key terms of Hume's philosophy, philosophical analysis and common sense: 'Hume's works from first to last can be seen as a dialogue between the philosophical analyst and the spokesman of common sense', a dialogue about 'the great questions to which there are no definite answers'. In other words, Hume is a philosophical sceptic as well as a follower of common sense, and he can make no definite choice between these poles. But this view seems extreme since in the essay on morals Hume declares that the role of inquiry is to 'find those universal principles, from which all censure or approbation is ultimately derived'; and in the essay on taste he urges that men 'must acknowledge a true and decisive standard to exist somewhere, to wit, real existence and matter of fact'. As a result of his assumption about Hume's method, Mr. Brunius is often left with unresolved contradictions, some of which can be explained by approaching Hume's statements chronologically. For example, in the *Treatise* (1739-40) Hume considers poetry an imperfect form of factual truth, but in the essay on taste (1757) he distinguishes between geometrical or exact truth and the empirical rules or truth of art. This disregard of chronology also leads Brunius to value Hume for the wrong reasons. The author declares that Hume 'repudiated the classical doctrine, "ut pictura poesis"'; yet this

footnote in 'Of Tragedy' (1757) was a repudiation not merely of the doctrine, but of an earlier statement by Hume which Brunius does not mention. In a note to *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748) Hume had declared: 'All poetry, being a species of painting, approaches us nearer to the objects. . . .'

Another difficulty with Brunius's approach to Hume's philosophy is his failure to realize that Hume's diverse approaches are sometimes the result of viewing a single problem from different perspectives. For example, Brunius indicates that the distinction between reason and sentiment is fundamental to Hume, and that the 'standard of knowledge is founded on the nature of things and it is eternal and inflexible, while the standard of taste is founded on the nature of man'. But in the *Treatise* Hume had declared: 'All probable reasoning is nothing but a species of sensation. 'Tis not solely in poetry and music, we must follow our taste and sentiment, but likewise in philosophy.' In the inquiry concerning morals Hume was emphasizing the difference between reason and taste, whereas in the *Treatise* he was stressing the similarity. That both are involved in any artistic judgement Hume makes clear in his two inquiries and in the essay on taste.

In fact, Brunius's discussion of the essay on taste, by indicating Hume's different approaches to the problem, results in one of the most rewarding sections of the book. Hume was a 'relativist but he considered that one can see certain fixed evaluations within a framework which limits an accepted taste'. Some judgements are better than others since they depend on empirical criteria; nevertheless different empirical criteria may lead to different judgements. Mr. Brunius's subtle analysis of this essay and his careful explication of the essay on tragedy constitute the most rewarding chapters of the work. The essay on taste makes Hume a 'semantic relativist', that is, a critic who believes that objective judgements about works of art can be made, but who recognizes that more than one objective judgement may be possible.

In dealing with Hume's practical criticism, Mr. Brunius is as puzzled as most of Hume's critics. In the literary valuations in the essays and the *History*, Hume 'stands out as the neoclassical judge'. Yet it is equally true that Hume supported 'typically romantic poets and poetic works' such as *Douglas* and *The Epigoniad*. Brunius's explanation of this phenomenon is, in part, that given by Ernest Mossner, namely, that Hume's support of Scottish authors and poets 'had its basis in local Scottish patriotism'. But this position certainly does not explain why the defence of these writers should be made in terms other than the customary neoclassicist rules.

Brunius summarizes Hume's achievement as the strengthening of neoclassical taste (by emphasizing 'the uniformity of esthetic standards'), and the breaking up of 'the established frame of taste' (by his 'psychological relativism'). Although the judgement is shared by critics like Kallich and Bate, it is perhaps relevant to inquire about the criteria for determining how a doctrine weakens or strengthens certain standards. Brunius assumes that Hume's doctrine had 'little influence and attention'. How, therefore, did it 'weaken' or 'strengthen' neoclassical taste? Secondly, Hume's relativism is 'objective', i.e. it insists on standards. In what sense, therefore, did it lead to individualistic or subjective relativism?

Thirdly, Hume's uniformity of standards is based on presuppositions completely different from those of neoclassicist critics. If theoretical assumptions are any guide to a critic's achievement, Hume made possible a new approach to taste by attacking the presuppositions of neoclassical theory. To assume, therefore, that Hume strengthened neoclassical taste is to confuse linguistic agreement with theoretical agreement. And this fallacy Hume specifically warned against: "The sentiments of men often differ with regard to beauty and deformity of all kinds, even while their general discourse is the same."

These deliberations do not deny that Hume deserves revaluation as an aesthetic theorist, but merely suggest that his influence and his associationism need to be reconsidered more comprehensively and that his 'experimental method' and reliance on 'experience' need to be included in any such study. It was Hume who declared that the foundation of the rules of composition 'is the same with that of all the practical sciences, experience'. Mr. Brunius does not deal with these perspectives of Hume, but he does uncover the range and complexity of Hume's aesthetic ideas; for this exploration, scholars are in his debt.

RALPH COHEN

Samuel Johnson's Literary Criticism. By JEAN H. HAGSTRUM. Pp. xi+212. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. \$3.50; 25s. net.

Mr. Hagstrum's book is an ambitious attempt to determine the concepts basic to Johnson's theory of literature. It has many recommendations: Mr. Hagstrum has conscientiously searched the canon for *loci critici*; he exhibits admirable familiarity with eighteenth-century criticism and recent Johnsonian scholarship; and, in refreshing contrast to the facile ineptitude of some older Johnsonian exegesis, he shows himself properly aware of the tremendous complexity of Johnson's mind and of the magnitude and difficulty of the task that engages him. For it is a very difficult task to chart the confused and luxuriant jungle of Johnson's literary criticism; and one Johnsonian may perhaps be permitted, while fully recognizing the merits of Mr. Hagstrum's work, to express some reservations about the methods he has used and the conclusions he has reached.

Johnson's own preference in critical method, as Mr. Hagstrum points out, was usually for the empirical, for the 'short flights frequently repeated' by which 'the widest excursions of the mind are made'. But Mr. Hagstrum is so little impressed by Johnson's example that he chooses to proceed deductively: to take up first 'what is general and fundamental . . . in order to provide some kind of theoretical foundation for the more specific aesthetic considerations that follow'; to consider 'Johnson on the mind' before 'Johnson on metaphor' (p. ix). So he begins by establishing Johnson's basic philosophy of knowledge, and, given this, goes on to derive his views on such matters as 'nature', 'wit', aesthetic pleasure, the roles of language and form, and the functions of the literary artist and critic. Unfortunately Johnson's basic philosophy is in fact even further from being ascertained than is his theory of literature. Without going into the formidable questions of epistemology that Mr. Hagstrum raises, I can only suggest that most students

will still agree with Johnson and feel that for a study of this kind to have most permanent value, the plan of investigation should be empirical and inductive; that we must know 'Johnson on metaphor' before we can proceed to the larger question of 'Johnson on the mind'; that 'the most lofty fabricks of science are formed by the continued accumulation of single propositions'.

Mr. Hagstrum's method of procedure is obviously related to his sympathy with the neo-Aristotelianism now fashionable in some schools of literature. Aristotle earns no fewer than twenty-six entries in his index, as compared with fifteen for Addison, nine for Burke, and three for Reynolds; he enters into the book oftener than Milton and nearly as often as Pope and Dryden. Waiving the question of whether Aristotle is really so relevant to Johnson, we may ask whether it is expedient, at this stage of our knowledge of Johnson, to spend much time demonstrating to what extent he fits into the patterns of Aristotelian and 'neo-classic' aesthetics. The Victorians thought they had adequately dealt with Johnson when they had demonstrated to what extent he did not fit into the romantic pattern; we reprobate them, but what some of our modern systematic students of Johnson are doing is perhaps not essentially different. The trouble with these approaches is that Johnson tends to disappear in the process, before we ever really know him. Can we not have, at least to begin with, an analysis of Johnson's criticism that is simply an analysis of Johnson's criticism? Surely this must come first; and the most useful contributions towards it have been made, I think, not by students whose interest is primarily in a system and only secondarily in Johnson, but in a few short studies, by Bertrand Bronson and Allen Tate for instance, where the writers have come down and grappled intimately with the problem of finding out just what Johnson did say and mean.

That in itself is not an easy undertaking; we all know that for nearly every opinion that Johnson expresses we can find elsewhere in Johnson something that seems to contradict it. Ideally, I suppose, the investigator should gather together all that Johnson said on a particular subject and then see to what extent the contradictions can be reconciled; it is surely not enough to quote individual dicta as though each necessarily represented an unalterable position of Johnson's. I do not know that Mr. Hagstrum has fully met the challenge of this admittedly difficult problem. At one point, for instance, arguing that Johnson was not an 'impressionistic' critic, he notes that Johnson 'defended Addison . . . from the charge that he decided "by taste rather than by principles"' (p. 27). If Johnson did so defend Addison (the reading of the passage is perhaps arguable), how are we to reconcile such a position with Johnson's better-known remark, which Mr. Hagstrum does not mention, about 'the cant of those who judge by principles rather than perception'? Can we generalize from the one comment while the other remains unexplained?

Mr. Hagstrum, like some other modern expositors of Johnson, relies heavily on the *Dictionary* as a source of information about Johnson's thought. Entries in the *Dictionary* may conceivably provide valuable clues to Johnson's opinions, but only, I think, if they are considered in the light of Johnson's conception of the function of a dictionary, about which Mr. Hagstrum does not always seem very clear. He makes a curious remark about Johnson's 'deep-seated skepticism

(somewhat surprising in a dictionary-maker) about the validity of literary definition' (p. 34). Is it surprising? Definition as practised by the literary critic may be intended to be normative; but the function of the dictionary-maker, as Johnson well understood, is not to 'form, but register the language'. The dictionary-maker, continually aware of the imprecision and vagaries of usage, might well be expected to doubt the use of manufacturing rigid definitions. Mr. Hagstrum goes so far as to conclude, solely from the fact that in the *Dictionary* Johnson defined *deism* as 'The opinion of those that only acknowledge one God, without the reception of any revealed religion', that he 'seems not to have accepted fully or even to have understood the doctrine of original sin or total depravity in its extremest forms' (p. 69). Presumably the reasoning is that deism entails the rejection of original sin, and that Johnson deliberately omitted this feature from his definition because he was in sympathy with the deistic view. But surely this line of argument cannot be maintained: Johnson is giving what is still the commonly received notion of what constitutes deism; he is writing a dictionary, not a confession of theological belief; he 'does not teach men how to think, but relates how they have hitherto expressed their thoughts'. Hence I am not too certain how useful, as evidence of Johnson's own beliefs, are Mr. Hagstrum's copious citations of *Dictionary* definitions of critical and philosophical terms.

In his concluding chapter, Mr. Hagstrum discloses a vague bias against modern criticism and seems to regard Johnson's as representing an opposing ideal. He remarks, apropos of Johnson's comment on Gray's *Elegy*, 'Such a view of literary art is admittedly that of the layman, who can only with the greatest difficulty ever be persuaded that "A poem should not mean/But be"' (p. 174). I should myself have hesitated to tell Johnson that his view of literature was not that of Pope and Dryden but that of Sir Robert Walpole or William, Duke of Gloucester ('Always scribble, scribble, scribble, eh, Mr. Gibbon?'). In all seriousness, no further currency should be given to the legend of Johnson as the layman's critic until someone has answered Mr. Leavis's proper rebuttal of it: 'Johnson . . . assumed a serious interest in things of the mind, and, for all his appeal to "the common reader", was constantly engaged in the business of bringing home to his public and his associates . . . that there were standards in these things above the ordinary level of the ordinary man.'

The fact is that, far from its being possible to set up Johnson and modern 'highbrow' critics as antitheses, it was precisely these modern critics (apart from a few valiant scholars in the academic world, to whom one fears the general literary public paid little attention) who rediscovered Johnson's excellence as a poet and greatness as a critic and rescued his reputation from the fatuous contempt of Macaulay-trained readers. No generation of critics has ever regarded Johnson with greater respect than those of the last quarter-century. Why Johnson's criticism has so impressed men like Mr. Eliot and Mr. Leavis is a pregnant question that we might have expected a modern book on the subject to try to answer; and if Mr. Hagstrum had cared to take the modern critical point of view more seriously, it is conceivable that he might have come closer than he has done to the heart of Johnson's attitude towards literature.

But the ideally cogent and definitive analysis of Johnson's criticism is unlikely

to be
work
as son
Mean
tory s

Misc
and
Let

This

1755,

and th

Lettre

three

with t

himse

1945).

Ever

and E

count

tour e

were e

time a

first h

more

this d

signifi

one co

is now

Misce

own r

British

a stran

Mme

when t

From

for wh

visited

No

He ha

nowhe

in 176

with a

Febru

to be in anyone's power to accomplish until a great deal of other preliminary work has been done; and it is a tribute to Mr. Hagstrum that he makes us see, as some earlier writers have not, how excitingly vast and intricate the subject is. Meanwhile, Mr. Hagstrum's book remains a stimulating and important exploratory study, which students of Johnson should not neglect.

D. J. GREENE

Miscellanea Gibboniana. Edited by GAVIN R. DE BEER, GEORGES A. BONNARD, and LOUIS JUNOD (Université de Lausanne, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres, x). Pp. 149. Lausanne: Rouge et Cie, 1952. No price given.

This volume contains the texts of the journal of a tour of Switzerland made in 1755, the fragments of the later journal relating to Gibbon's stay in Paris in 1763, and the unfinished treatise on the Government of Berne generally known as *Lettre d'un Suédois*. The first two items have never been published before. All three texts have now been edited from the manuscripts in the British Museum with the meticulous accuracy which Professor Bonnard set up as a standard for himself and others in his edition of *Gibbon's Lausanne Journal, 1763-4* (Lausanne, 1945).

Even more than Gibbon himself, Mr. de Beer is at home both in Switzerland and England, and has made valuable studies of the history of travel in the former country. He thus brings a wealth of illustration to his commentary on Gibbon's tour enabling us to view it in its right perspective. Young men on their travels were expected to send home descriptive letters or journals partly to prove that time and money had been well spent, partly to provide valuable information at first hand which was not otherwise available. Few can have achieved either aim more thoroughly than did Gibbon, and his editor rightly stresses the interest of this document both as a picture of contemporary Switzerland and as a first and significant work from the future historian's pen. It was natural that more than one copy of this journal should have existed, and the editor traces these so far as is now possible, and also Sheffield's abortive project to include the whole in the *Miscellaneous Works*. The existence of the work has been known from Gibbon's own references to it, and biographers have had access to the manuscript in the British Museum since 1894. The writing is solid rather than vivacious. One gets a strange vision of the youth setting out in a great coach with the Pavillards. Mme Pavillard was left at Aarau and insisted on their staying some days there when they called for her on the return journey, evidently to Gibbon's annoyance. From Zürich to Einsiedeln the two men travelled in a litter, the road being unfit for wheels. The adventure was lumbering and strenuous, thirty-two towns were visited, and stays made at sixteen of them between 21 September and 20 October.

No doubt we lost a great diarist in Gibbon. But one cannot have everything. He had the best of intentions which he was constantly failing to realize. This is nowhere more apparent than in the three fragments relating to his stay in Paris in 1763: a short introduction explaining the change-over from English to French, with a plan for a systematic narrative never realized; entries for a few days in February; and about 9 pages of *Idée générale de mon séjour à Paris*, written

retrospectively, as Professor Bonnard shows, at Lausanne. This passage, including the story of his equivocal relations with Mme Bontemps, has been known in the manuscript to biographers in recent years. Professor Bonnard has studied and edited the text with his usual acumen, and future investigators will do well to realize how much he has done for them.

The treatise on the Government of Berne has been well known since Sheffield included it as Letter No. IX in the *Miscellaneous Works*. It has been of great interest to the historians of Switzerland and has been reprinted in that country in whole or part, sometimes with considerable variations of text. Mr. Louis Junod has traced the history of these printings more fully than anyone so far, and provides us with his own text, which is the closest possible reproduction in print of the unique autograph manuscript in the British Museum. For English readers the main interest in this letter is the question of its date. Sheffield thought it belonged to the first residence in Lausanne. Junod, following hints from one of his Swiss predecessors, concludes that the letter was written in 1763-4, after an exhaustive study of the actual manuscript and consideration of internal and external evidence. On balance he is probably right.

D. M. Low

Shelley: The Last Phase. By IVAN ROE. Pp. 256. London: Hutchinson, 1953. 18s. net.

Mr. Roe is not Professor White's ideal, the biographer who remains unobtrusively in the background, and his account of the last sixty-nine days of Shelley's life is confessedly a novelist's interpretation. The compression in time is made in an attempt to avoid what is described as the falsifications of the chronological method: we begin, fashionably, at the end of the story, and move back when it is necessary.

It is of course true that Shelley's life, like anyone else's, is overscored and overlaid and not measurable by the calendar alone, but it is hard to see what the biographer can do about this, except to turn from biography to the fluid and penetrable material of the novel. Shelley's memory, the recorder of the overscored life, is inaccessible and the normal materials of letter, journal, legend, and even poetry are not here—and perhaps cannot be—altered in chronological order in such a way as to give what Mr. Roe somewhat mysteriously calls the extra dimension. The flashbacks are handled with agility and clarity, though the clarity may depend in part on the prior possession of a time chart on which the roaming facts may be placed, but they seem to have no function other than that of novel compression.

There are other attempts to add 'dimension' in the use of historical material, often in the form of lively and relevant reference to contemporary records, and in the use of deliberately 'evocative' description of Italian scenery. Like the experiment in chronology the description is used modestly enough but given rather too pretentious an advertisement.

In the discussion of biographical puzzles Mr. Roe does not inflict the novelist's inventiveness upon us, but it must be said that his fondness for speculation

appears excessive in the light of his own admirable comments on the unreliability of external record as a guide to motive. He sets down some of the principles of biographical agnosticism but sometimes forgets them in the irresistible pursuit of possibilities. Elise and Paolo Foggi are the new suggested candidates for the maternity and paternity of Elena Adelaide Shelley, the subject of the Hoppner scandal. It is a surmise no weaker than others except that there seems to be no reason either why Mary Shelley should not have known or why she should not have disclosed it, especially in her letter to Mrs. Hoppner. But it is a matter in which one guess is as good as another.

The same applies to speculation about Shelley's despair in 1818, sometimes supposed to be obliquely expressed in 'Julian and Maddalo'. Mr. Roe puts forward the possibility of Mary's confession of an infidelity and a card-castle of possibility is built of a possible interpretation of a narrative poem and a possible interpretation of Mary's correspondence with Hogg. Professor White's suggestion that the crisis was possibly related to Mary's reaction to Clara's death, for which she might have blamed Shelley, is both sounder and more tentative. It is a pity that speculation should be so little controlled by the impossibility of certain knowledge.

It is also encouraged here by Mr. Roe's use of Shelley's poetry. Nine biographers out of ten do not know what to do about their poet's writing but apparently feel that they must do something. The guiding portrait of Shelley's virility and humour underplays his capacity for self-deception and vacillation, in spite of the accusation that 'academic critics' neglect the fluidity of his emotional expression in verse, and it tends to impose itself on the critical interpretation. Shelley's relations with Jane Williams are whitewashed and 'We Meet Not As We Parted' interpreted as a possible reference to Mary, with the rather heavy comment that if it referred to Jane it would be 'tantamount to calling the lady light'. The brilliant modulations of 'The Magnetic Lady to her Patient' are interpreted as 'a friendly jest, not a love lyric', quotation being discreetly confined to the last stanza. There are other more pointless readings of biographical reference like the suggestion that the twin babes, Death and Life, in 'Epipsychidion' are Clara and William Shelley, where the allocation seems evasive.

The study of Shelley's affinities with Petrarch would have been more valuable if it had discriminated more sharply between common poetic images like the dawn of love or the labyrinth of life, or the normal human association of hope and fear, of which Mr. Roe makes much, and more direct echoes of Petrarch's *Trionfi*. Sometimes the comparisons are surely contrasts, as in the discussion of Petrarch's sense of the pressure of death, which is put beside Shelley's sense of the pressure of the past. Since we are promised a study of Petrarch which will show his influence as more powerful than 'was hitherto suspected', more generous reference to earlier work would seem desirable. The discussion of Shelley's concept of love, for instance, calls for some mention of Professor Notopoulos's comparison of Shelley's and Petrarch's platonic concept with Dante's sexual symbolism; and Professor White's suggestion that 'The Triumph of Life' is a condensation of all the *Trionfi* might be set beside Mr. Roe's view that Shelley's poem is a complement to the *Trionfo d'amore*. In view of occasional veiled criticism of 'academic

critics', reference to earlier and more detailed work is ungracefully omitted, though perhaps Mr. Roe should be excused since he is writing a fairly brief popular biography. The peripheral study of the Petrarch affinities is itself rather curious in such a work, and is perhaps a mark of a biographer's uncomfortable feeling that biography is not enough.

BARBARA HARDY

The Victorian Sage. By JOHN HOLLOWAY. Pp. viii+301. London: Macmillan, 1953. 18s. net.

The teachings of the major Victorian prophets or sages, when reduced to summary form, are bafflingly simple. In their own day they were living blossoms that captivated; but who, fingering these crushed, faded petals, can convince himself it was really so? To careless eyes the revelations of Carlyle or Arnold seem portentously trite. But as we come to admire the Victorians, ever more unreservedly, the question needs to be put again. Mr. Holloway examines the activity of the Victorian sage and is able to demonstrate that a perceptive reading can bring back the original bloom of their thought, its earliest appeal. He concerns himself with a group of writers who vary considerably in their tone and imaginative power, but all of whom stand with Coleridge rather than with John Stuart Mill. In the *Aids to Reflection* Coleridge foreshadows their attitude: '... I assume a something, the proof of which no man can give to another, yet every man may find for himself.' Its implications are worked out in Newman's doctrine of Real Assent, that can be granted only to arguments 'too various for direct enumeration, too personal and deep for words, too powerful and concurrent for refutation'. '... One and the same teaching is in different aspects both object and proof, and elicits one complex act both of inference and of assent.' This kind of teaching, part philosophical and part moral, requires a complex act of the critical mind to analyse and evaluate it. Such 'organic thinking', which is 'presented not by one thread of logical argument alone, but by the whole weave of a book', cannot be studied by the accepted rules of rhetoric. Mr. Holloway insists that the critic must have a sense of a work's total effect as well as of the peculiar control of meaning that its author exercises in detail. He must be prepared to submit at least momentarily to the pattern woven by the sage, a pattern in which ideas, as Newman said of Catholic doctrines, 'are members of one family, and suggestive, or correlative, or confirmatory, or illustrative of each other'. The sage does not work merely by sleight of hand, but to evaluate what he has done is made more difficult by the inadequacy of our usual standards of judgement. Mr. Holloway hints that Carlyle (whose *Frederick the Great* he refurbishes with surprising skill) sometimes falls into nonsense, and that not all of Newman's beautiful play is innocent; but he confines himself in this book to explaining 'a distinctive activity, a unique use of words'.

It is admirably done. We are introduced to the activity through Carlyle—a fiery baptism, perhaps, but a necessary one. Carlyle's simple (and in part contradictory) ideas are briefly stated. Then we are shown how by various means—especially by recurring imagery and turbulent style—he creates in the reader the sense of a vast animated cosmos. Carlyle's strength lies in his manipulation of

metaphor, which enables him to oppose the 'sham' and the 'real' at every turn, and his skill in modifying the uses of words, so that paradox becomes blended with truism. These methods he employs on a grand scale in *The French Revolution* and *Frederick the Great*, where he evaluates human life as a 'prophet-historian'.

From Carlyle we proceed to Disraeli—the only member of Mr. Holloway's group whose credentials seem dubious. Of course, Disraeli is mediating a world view, and Leslie Stephen could praise his novels; but although Mr. Holloway shows considerable verve in making a case for Disraeli, the reader senses a shade of discomfort beneath it all. How much more rewarding is the chapter on George Eliot, whose conception of human life is illustrated first from *Silas Marner* and then amplified from the rest of her novels. George Eliot provides through Adam Bede yet another formulation of the sage's insight: 'It isn't notions sets people doing the right thing—it's feelings.' How she sustains the sense of a world in which innumerable lives are submitted to the manifold pressures of necessity, Mr. Holloway demonstrates lucidly and sensitively. The chapter on Hardy likewise enables him to build up a cogent picture of Hardy's imaginative effect which, no more than George Eliot's, can be described adequately in terms of the philosophy held by the writer.

The vision of a novelist, as Mr. Holloway admits, is extremely complicated. It cannot be analysed so fully or convincingly as that of a publicist like Arnold, or an apologist like Newman. The chapters on these two writers, who resemble each other in their engaging modesty and urbane style, are perhaps the most successful in Mr. Holloway's always illuminating book. He is able to bring his particular gifts to bear on Newman's methods with a delight that he communicates to the reader; and on Arnold he writes happily and with penetration. Of the Victorian sages these two—neither of whom is quite representative of the genus—seem the most assured and the most persuasive. It may be that unlike the others they are literary artists quite free from Carlyle's rodomontade, the false brilliance of Disraeli, and the real dullness that can mar the writing of George Eliot and Hardy. The felicities of Newman and Arnold arise out of the tradition which Burke fostered before them. For dealing with the half-light where ideas merge into sentiments, and the shapes of things change under the master's touch, Newman and Arnold have none to rival them. Good writing, they seem to suggest, is a method of recommending oneself to the reader's acceptance by the finest tact and insinuation. Mr. Holloway is of their school in *The Victorian Sage*—which one hopes will be followed by an attempt to evaluate the truth (or should it be the integrity?) that informs the sage's purpose. HENRY GIFFORD

The Genevese Background. Studies of Shelley, Francis Danby, Maria Edgeworth, Ruskin, Meredith, and Joseph Conrad in Geneva with hitherto unpublished letters. By H. W. HÄUSERMANN. Pp. x+224 with 16 half-tone plates. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1952. 18s. net.

Essentially this is a work of literary history rather than criticism, and it is as an historian that the author is most successful. A preface defines his purpose as

'merely to carry on the research that has been done by Dr. Guillaume Fatio and others who have studied the rôle played by this city in the lives and works of English writers', but the regional study which this note and the title imply is not fully developed in all of the seven essays that the volume contains. Thus diligent research has resolved the problem of the house Shelley occupied in Geneva in 1816, and has filled a gap in the biography of Francis Danby by tracing his debts and sources of income in Geneva between 1829 and 1836, but there is no assessment of the effect Geneva had on their work. Professor Häusermann regrets that Danby has been 'so long neglected by reason of Victorian prudery and the unfavourable evolution of modern taste', and he reproduces six of Danby's paintings, but he does not otherwise attempt to restore Danby's reputation, to discuss his treatment of the Genevese landscape, or to compare it with the literature of the period.

The reprinted lectures on Meredith and Conrad are more critical but here the historical bias leads to some questionable conclusions. Analysis of *Under Western Eyes* discloses a distorted presentation of Geneva:

Geneva is a harsher place than Siberia or the east coast of Borneo. There Conrad found neither the broad harmony of the Slavonic spirit, nor the brotherliness of all human beings, nor the feeling of kinship among men in their hopes and sorrows. . . . Geneva stirred no such feelings in Conrad, and she appears, in his eyes, curiously shrunken.

Dr. Häusermann has already noted that

Having drunk to the lees the scorn and obloquy that his past misdeeds have earned him, Razumov crawls away from Geneva, a broken man, to end his days in Russia. . . . Razumov forfeits both ideal and honour. He loses faith in himself, and his values are destroyed.

But he does not sufficiently recognize that this sickness of the exiled Razumov and his friends may prejudice their view of Geneva, which, in any case, is not necessarily Conrad's. The knowledge that Conrad's visits to Geneva were clouded by sickness (his own or his family's) and that he was an exile himself at the time leads Professor Häusermann, in his anxiety to correct what he considers an unfair view of his own city, too readily to identify fictitious characters with their creator. There is a similar identification of fact with fiction in discussing *The Tragic Comedians*.

The most valuable chapters in the book are those where Professor Häusermann draws on hitherto unpublished correspondence between English writers and Genevese friends. The thirteen letters of Ruskin to Dr. Louis-André Gosse, the Swiss physician, are brief but the account that is given of the relationship between the two men forms an interesting extension to that in *Praeterita*. The notes on Ruskin's attempt to purchase 'the entire barren top of a crag' on which to build himself 'a den', and the description of mid-century Swiss politics fill in the Genevese background in a useful and vivid way.

Over half the book is devoted to the first publication and discussion of a bulky correspondence between the Edgeworths and Genevese friends, and if other sections indicate the limitations of this type of study this chapter is an ample

vindication of it. The correspondence extends from 1801, when R. L. Edgeworth writes to M. Pictet proposing to visit him, to 1829, when Maria writes a letter of condolence on the death of Étienne Dumont. Maria's debt to Geneva is defined as threefold: the editors of the *Bibliothèque Britannique* were responsible for making her works widely known on the Continent, she received 'social and intellectual stimulus' from them, from Étienne Dumont, from Auguste de Staël and from her other correspondents, and her attitude to Madame de Staël with its 'mixed feeling of admiration and moral superiority' is convincingly demonstrated as having an important bearing upon her own work. Each of these points is well developed and admirably documented from the letters and the novels, and although it is claimed that the novels contain 'her deepest and maturest thought; her letters reflect more the surface of her mind', the variety, range and spontaneity of those letters will send readers back to the novels with renewed interest and deepened understanding as a result of Professor Häusermann's work.

D. S. R. WELLAND

The Family Affairs of Sir Thomas Phillipps. By A. N. L. MUNBY (Phillipps Studies, No. 2). Pp. xiv+119. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. 15s. net.

Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart., of Middle Hill in the county of Worcester and subsequently of Thirlestaine House, Cheltenham, was born in 1792 and died in 1872; his earliest serious book purchases seem to have been made during his Oxford sojourn, which began in 1811, and by the date of his death his collection of manuscripts amounted to a little under 40,000 items. Thus he bestrode like a colossus the book world between the generation of those whose exploits in the sale room are recorded enthusiastically by Dibdin and that of Huth and Lord Crawford and the clients of Bernard Quaritch; his only contemporary rival, indeed, was Bertram, fourth Earl of Ashburnham. An insatiable appetite for the acquisition of manuscript material was his 'Ruling Passion', and the effect of this on his character and on his relations with all with whom he came into contact would have made him a fit subject for one of Pope's Moral Essays. His irascibility, his financial difficulties, his meanness, his religious fanaticism and his hatred of his son-in-law, Halliwell, were of course known to at least some of his contemporaries, but, generally speaking, for us today Phillipps the man has been submerged in Phillipps the collector; after all he died as long ago as 1872. The story of both, however, could only be told by someone having unrestricted access to the family papers and with the purchase of these (with the residue of the library) by Messrs. W. H. Robinson of Pall Mall a full-length study became practicable; the results of Mr. Munby's researches into this material are being made available in the monographs entitled *Phillipps Studies*, the first of which was an account of Phillipps's privately printed catalogues. Had Phillipps been an agreeable personality the question of his biography and its place in the series would have presented no difficulty, but unfortunately he was anything but pleasant and Mr. Munby was faced with the problem either of setting down the bare facts of his life perhaps by way of introduction to one of the volumes or of boldly coming out into the open and telling the whole distasteful story. Mr.

Munby bravely but wisely chose the latter course and by his skilful selection from a vast amount of material and tactful and happy presentation has produced a masterpiece. Even Mr. Munby's restrained telling of the facts cannot make us like his subject, but it is important that we should know what sort of man it was who accumulated against all competitors and with unwavering energy the vast collections housed first at Middle Hill and then at Thirlestaine House. From his father (senior partner of Phillipps, Lowe and Company, calico manufacturers and printers of Cannon Street, Manchester) he inherited his stubbornness, energy, and love of litigation; he was an illegitimate child and his mother was not allowed to visit him. Furthermore, his father's ideas on education were based on Lord Chesterfield's letters and were not helpful. However, from 1818, when his father died, Phillipps was his own master, his independence nevertheless curtailed by the terms of his father's will (under which he had access to the income only of his estates) and by the financial embarrassments in which his collecting involved him all his life. As might be expected, as the years went on his temper grew worse; in 1843 he was involved at Middle Hill in an undignified rough-house with the local tax collector and in fact we find one of his daughters writing in this year of her father: 'He is become so odd this last month [August] that we all have serious thoughts that he is going rather cracked.' His religion took the form of a violent anti-Catholicism, which (as Mr. Munby points out) developed in the later years of his life into a 'frenzied, almost pathological, hatred'. But the sustaining emotion of his life (apart from his collecting mania) was his hatred for James Orchard Halliwell (whom his daughter Henrietta had married against his will in 1842), a hatred made all the more bitter by the knowledge that under the terms of his father's will (as he had no sons himself) Halliwell would inherit the estates. It was the knowledge of this that led him to remove his collections in 1863 and 1864 to Thirlestaine House, the purchase of which brought further financial difficulty—'The obligation to buy this House all arises from the curse of Entails upon Bitches of disobedient daughters', as he pleasantly wrote to his bookseller, Boone, in 1867. The story of the appalling way in which Phillipps acted in his relations with Henrietta and her husband is admirably handled by Mr. Munby. Indeed, if Mr. Munby errs at all in this work, it is, we feel, a little too much on the side of charity, and it is delightful to read on the other side the outburst which Sir Frederic Madden committed to his journal on reading the *Athenaeum's* obituary of Phillipps.

C. E. WRIGHT

Miss Horniman and the Gaiety Theatre, Manchester. By REX POGSON. Pp. xvi+216. London: Rockcliffe, 1952. 21s. net.

Modern Drama. By MARTIN LAMM. Translated by KARIN ELLIOTT. Pp. xx+359. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952. 25s. net.

Ibsen's Dramatic Method: A Study of the Prose Dramas. By JOHN NORTHAM. Pp. 232. London: Faber & Faber, 1953. 21s. net.

These three books are of widely differing kinds; the first a biography limited almost entirely to a specific theatrical activity; the second a survey so wide as to

make critical studies of even major dramatists impossible, and the third a close investigation of one aspect of one dramatist's technique. All contribute something to our knowledge or understanding of theatrical history or dramatic art.

Mr. Rex Pogson concentrates on the part of Miss Horniman's life associated with the Gaiety Theatre in Manchester, and students of the modern theatre owe him a debt for his timely rescuing of much that might, in a few more years, have been beyond recovery; although his main sources are playbills, newspaper notices, and theatre records, important details and many critical estimates derive from the memories of Miss Horniman's fellow workers. The clarity with which the work of the Gaiety is recorded makes us wish that it had been possible to recover more facts about her brief but significant contacts with the Avenue and the Abbey Theatres. The full story of Miss Horniman's career would fill gaps in many passages of late nineteenth-century theatre history, now recognized as landmarks though at the time they passed almost unrecorded.

For, as the book proceeds, we realize afresh how many modern movements were affected or illustrated by the work of the Gaiety from 1907 to 1917. As the first of the English repertory theatres, it has a long list of descendants; its influence on the professional repertories (and indirectly on the stock companies which Mr. Pogson rightly distinguishes) may be traced on both sides of the Atlantic and later touches indirectly the widespread amateur dramatic movement. As the theatre which sponsored a large number of one-act plays, it was in the forefront of a tendency already gaining ground and soon to become one of the mainstays of the amateur dramatic revival. The ideals, moreover, of its founders and of its first producers, Iden Payne and Sir Lewis Casson, the standards of the plays chosen and the technique of producing and acting, came upon the London, Canadian, and American theatres with an impact whose effects may easily be forgotten or misunderstood.

Professor Martin Lamm's *Modern Drama* is concerned with such parts of drama (not the theatre), between the début of Scribe and the present day, as the author finds significant for his purpose. The period immediately preceding is summed up in his Introduction and there follow chapters on the chief French, Scandinavian, Russian, German, Austrian, English, Irish, American, Italian, and Spanish dramatists, with interchapters on the rise of naturalism and the first symbolists. Dramatists who are of major importance for the author's interpretation of world drama have individual chapters (Dumas *fils*, Augier, Bjørnson, Ibsen, Strindberg, and others); the countries whose drama is of less importance in this view have merely brief surveys. This procedure is intelligible enough, though, even on the author's own terms, as set out in his preface, a book written in 1948 might well have carried the tale of Irish drama down at least to Sean O'Casey and possibly to some mention of Johnston, Shiels, and Carroll after him. Space might also have been found for notice of a few modern Scandinavians, or at least for Nordahl Grieg, and it might also be argued that American drama has gained something from the work of Thornton Wilder. All these writers could perhaps be regarded as having some 'significance' (present or future, actual or potential) 'for world drama' (p. vii).

But it is easy to cavil over omissions in a work of this scope and in fact

Professor Lamm's achievement is remarkable rather for the amount it succeeds in including and correlating than for omissions of writers not known until just before or during the recent war. More interesting are the judgements made on individual dramatists, the comparisons between them which Professor Lamm so fruitfully draws, and, above all, the grouping and placing of them within the main dramatic movements of the period. Professor Lamm acknowledges that he approaches from the position of the Swedish reader and for this very reason the comments often serve as salutary correctives to English assumptions and presuppositions; no amount of arguing from the English angle brings out so clearly the deserved primacy of the French tradition in the nineteenth century, or the isolation of the contemporary English drama and the delay in its renaissance. But, in fact, Professor Lamm is a European and his familiarity with the continental dramatic tradition at once gives him an advantage over most English scholars and makes his book of special service to English students. Irresistibly there appear, to the English view, to be some odd judgements; it is hard to ask of any continental people, except the one or two who share our sense of humour, to gauge the moods of *The Playboy of the Western World* (and it is only fair to admit that both Irish and English have misinterpreted it in their day); it is perhaps a little odder that *Back to Methuselah* should meet such short shrift on p. 280, though not that *Saint Joan* should be raised to a higher dramatic standing than any other play of Shaw. But this assessment in terms of continental traditions and relations is precisely the kind of thing which gives the book value.

Dr. John Northam's study of the nature and symbolic function of visual presentation in Ibsen's plays is a scholarly piece of thinking, an economical statement of results which are themselves the end-product of careful analysis and examination of evidence. The author is widely read, not only in Ibsen's own writings but in the literature surrounding them, and draws on it with discrimination to support his thesis. Ibsen's characters, he argues, have been often misinterpreted through disregard (scholars and theatre-men seem guilty in about equal proportions here) for the delicate pointers which Ibsen provided, often deliberately adding them in the course of redrafting, in stage directions underlined by parallel situation and resulting in a 'concealed symbolism' (p. 13) which, if observantly followed, would have guided us clear. The long list of misconceptions mentioned or quoted in the footnotes as due directly to this disregard of symbolic hints in 'set, properties, costume, lighting, action, make-up and parallel situation' makes it clear that this study is in fact necessary and timely. Even lifelong students of Ibsen who are in some degree aware of his habits can find much delight and no little instruction in Northam's book.

His principles are summarized in the introduction and his analytical method set out in Chapters I and II (*The Doll's House* and *Pillars of Society*). After this method has been made clear and the examinations of visual presentation and parallel situation throughout the play illuminated by the evidence of the successive drafts, the formal classification is put aside and the subsequent chapters offer studies of the plays in the light of the combined evidence from all these categories. As the examination proceeds, the author shows us that in this branch of his technique as elsewhere there is a steady progression in Ibsen's art from

Pillars of Society to the climax of this peculiar skill, a fusion of the symbol with the action and with the scene, until, in *Rosmersholm*, 'We approach the apogee of Ibsen's skill in visual suggestion; there is scarcely a detail which does not admit of a realistic explanation, and yet the consistency with which the detail is used to form a progressive pattern throughout the play, the care which Ibsen took to introduce this pattern as he worked from the draft to the play, and the evidence that in earlier plays he was groping for exactly this technique, all justify us in claiming for *Rosmersholm* the praise due not to a "realistic" drama, but to a work of intricate though concealed manipulation in the interests of character-drawing' (p. 129).

No one who is seriously concerned with the art of Ibsen or with the nature of dramatic technique at all times, but especially in the last hundred years in the West, can afford to overlook this volume.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR

The Place-Names of Cumberland. By A. M. ARMSTRONG, A. MAWER, F. M. STENTON, and BRUCE DICKINS. English Place-Name Society, Vols. XX, XXI, XXII. Part I, pp. vii+258; Part II, pp. 259-457; Part III, pp. lxxx+458-565. Cambridge: University Press; Parts I and II, 1950; Part III, 1952. 18s. net each part.

The names which form the subject of *The Place-Names of Cumberland*, the most recent publication of the English Place-Name Society, of which the last of three parts has recently appeared, have presented to the editors, Miss A. M. Armstrong, the late Sir Allen Mawer, Sir Frank Stenton, and Professor Bruce Dickins, problems greater than those encountered in previous volumes in the series, not only because of difficulties inherent in the names themselves, drawn as they are from several languages, but also because of the scarcity of early forms. The Cumberland volumes, notable for their comprehensiveness, fully maintain the high standards set by their predecessors in the series. Comparison with W. J. Sedgefield's *Place-Names of Cumberland and Westmorland* (1915) will, moreover, show what great progress has been made in these studies, both in interpretation and in the recognition now accorded to the Celtic, and in particular the Irish, element in the place-names of this area. The editors in the Preface acknowledge their indebtedness to Professor Ekwall (among other scholars) for his help, and in their articles on individual place-names his interpretations in his *Dictionary of English Place-Names* and elsewhere are frequently cited. I have not, however, noticed in the Society's volumes any comment on Professor Ekwall's article on *Briscoe*, Cumberland, in his *Dictionary*. There forms from two separate places now similarly named would seem to have been brought together under one head, and they are interpreted as ON. *birki-skógr*, 'birch wood'. But according to the information now provided by the editors, *Briscoe* in St. John Beckermert (p. 340) is earlier *Breta-skógr*, 'wood of the Britons', and *Brisco* in St. Cuthbert Without (p. 148) is OE. *bi(e)rc-sceaga*, 'birch copse' (with confusion in the second element between OE. *sceaga*, 'copse', and its ON. cognate *skógr*, 'wood').

In several respects these volumes break new ground. References are now given

to reviews of earlier volumes in the series, and field-names of interest are included in the Index. The fresh assessment in the Introduction (in Part III) from the pen of Professor Dickins, of the historical background against which these place-names must be studied, is of exceptional interest; short sections are added on the wards of Cumberland, and on the contribution of mining to local place-names. In the interpretation of the Romano-British place-names, to which an Appendix is devoted, the editors have had the help of Professor I. A. Richmond. A new photographic reproduction of the letter or writ (in the sole surviving, thirteenth-century version) addressed to his dependents in Cumberland by the Cumberland magnate Gospatric, lord of Allerdale and Dalston (most probably to be identified with the Gospatric who was murdered in 1064 at the court of King Edward the Confessor), will be of value, since Liebermann's reproduction of 1903 and Ragg's of 1917 are not generally accessible. This unique document is an historical monument of some importance, and it is also of great linguistic interest as exhibiting in its place-names and personal names the diverse elements in the Cumbrian racial complex.

There is also provided a large distribution map of a new kind, quite unlike any map hitherto published by the Society in showing (simplified) relief, on which is demonstrated by the use of symbols and combinations of symbols the distribution of British, Anglian, Scandinavian, Gaelic, and French place-names for which there is (for Cumberland) reasonably early evidence; also the distribution of hybrid place-names; of inversion compounds; and of words compounded with *-sætr* and *-erg*. Since a number of the recorded instances are absent the map will not give a complete picture of the distribution of the names in these categories, but it is nevertheless an interesting experiment in relating racial settlement to topography. In the absence of a rubric, it should be noted that the use of square brackets in the List of Parishes which is given on p. 564 as a key to the map is intended to indicate the many changes in parish boundaries which took place between the publication of the six-inch Ordnance Survey sheets (on which the list of parishes here and in the text is based) and the publication in 1941 of the Ordnance Survey diagram of Cumberland (which is the basis of the parish boundaries given on the map).

The penetration into Cumberland of settlers of various races is discussed in some detail by Professor Dickins. Besides the more obvious monuments of Roman occupation such as Hadrian's Wall, certain place-names such as *Burgh by Sands* (where the *burh* is the Roman fort of ABALLAVA) and *Cardurnock* (where *Car-* is from a British word corresponding to Welsh *caer*, 'fortified place') are reminiscent of Roman occupation. The same element *Car* (*Cair*) was prefixed as early as the ninth century to forms representing the old Romano-British name for Carlisle—a difficult name, the elucidation of which is here carried a stage further. Though little is known from historical or literary sources of the period following the Roman evacuation of the Wall when British princes ruled in Cumberland ('the land of the *Cymry*', the Welsh), many river and stream names testify to British occupation, and about thirty other names of British origin appear (usually compounded) in Cumberland place-names, mostly on rising or high ground, but also, exceptionally, in the coastal strip. Whatever may have been the origin of

the association, the court of King Arthur is set in Carlisle or in the Forest of Inglewood (or both) in a group of Middle English romances belonging to the Arthurian cycle, and in almost all the romances for which a Cumberland setting is provided Sir Gawain plays an important part (pp. xviii-xix).

There is no evidence that the British occupation of the Lakeland hills was seriously challenged by the Anglian settlers seeking good farmland who occupied largely the coastal regions and some of the river valleys, and for whose progress there is evidence not only in place-names and in historical sources but also in the sculptured stones of the area. An examination of the principal elements employed in Cumberland place-names will show, as is to be expected, that the English element predominates in the area, but the Scandinavian element is also very large.

Of racial migrations into Cumberland the most interesting perhaps is that of Scandinavian settlers from the west, from Scandinavian colonies in Ireland or the Isle of Man, who were Norwegians (not Danes) by descent but much modified in their speech by their stay in an Irish-speaking area. Migration from the west, extensive as it was, has strangely enough escaped mention in contemporary chronicles. The sole reference that we have, in an obscure Irish chronicle of doubtful authority, concerns only a Scandinavian settlement on the Wirral peninsula (which has left its mark on local place-names) by a certain Viking leader named Ingimund very early in the tenth century. Dr. F. T. Wainwright, who has discussed in detail Ingimund's invasion and its Irish sources, as well as the Scandinavian immigration into Lancashire,¹ suggests that the Norse immigration into Cumberland and Westmorland may well have been a later or a longer process. Of the magnitude of the Norse immigration into Cumberland we have abundant evidence not only in major place-names showing Scandinavian influence, but also in field names and other minor names; this suggests that the language of the area must have been strongly Scandinavianized at the period (in most cases long after the settlements took place) when these minor names were given. Even English names sometimes become Scandinavianized, as for example *Gosforth* (p. 393), where the final *-th* (for earlier *-d*) in the modern name is due to Scandinavian influence (shown again in this district in the decoration of the famous Gosforth Cross), and *Stainton* (p. 188), where the spelling and the medieval forms probably reflect the Scandinavian dialect of the countryside.

Irish-Scandinavian place-names in Cumberland are often compounded with *-erg*, a loan-word from Irish *airigh*, 'shieling, hill pasture', as for instance *Birker*, *Cleator* (p. 471). Irish personal names appear in numerous place-names, as for instance *Cartán* in *Hobcartan*, *Corcán* in *Mockerkin* (p. 507). But the most striking manifestation of Irish-Scandinavian influence is to be seen in 'inversion-compounds', with inversion of the elements in the word whereby the defined term comes first, as in Irish *Downpatrick*. To the list of inversion-compounds given by Professor Dickens (pp. xxiii-xxiv) a few more could be added: *Birdoswald*, *Drumleaning*, *Cumwhinton*, *Caterlaising*, *Ravenglass* (pp. 115, 119, 161, 271, 425).

¹ 'Ingimund's Invasion', *English Historical Review*, April 1948, pp. 145-69; 'The Scandinavians in Lancashire', *Trans. of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, viii (1945-6), pp. 71-116; and for another reference, *ibid.*, p. 72, note.

These are of the less common type in which the first element is Celtic and not Germanic.

Of particular interest among those place-names which were formed after the Norman Conquest with the element *-by* preceded by a Norman-French or continental or other personal name are *Rickerby*, *Glassonby*, and others, which can be traced back to known individuals of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (pp. xxxii-xxxiii). The French element in place-names in this area is, however, not large. Of the major names in Cumberland the one most recently bestowed is *Maryport*, called *Elmfoot*, 'foot of the (River) Ellen', until the middle of the eighteenth century, when Humphrey Senhouse gave the name of his wife Mary to his new port. Senhouse Dock and Senhouse Street in Whitehaven are also called after his family (p. xxxviii).

The wealth of information, agricultural, social, linguistic, and so forth, incorporated in the field and minor names of the Lancashire Hundred of Amounderness has recently been illustrated by Dr. Wainwright;¹ investigation of Cumberland minor names would no doubt produce similar results. Popular superstitions are for instance illustrated in Cumberland place-names such as *Scratgate* (p. 401), interpreted by the editors as probably 'goblin road', from ON. *skratti*, 'goblin, spectre', and ON. *gata*, 'road'; in *Thursgill* (p. 207), 'giant ravine', from OE. *þyrs*, ON. *purs*, 'giant', found also in other compounds, and ON. *gil*, 'ravine'; in the words compounded with OE. *ælf*, 'elf, fairy' (p. 459); and in the major name *Skinburness* (p. 294), a Scandinavianized compound of OE. *scinnburg*, 'demon or spectre haunted stronghold'. In minor as in major names there are instances of words (remarked upon by the editors) which antedate by centuries the earliest instances recorded in *O.E.D.*: e.g. *blaeberry* (p. 202), *cockshot* (p. 278), *fog*, 'rough grass' (p. 329); and also of words such as **risp*, 'brushwood' (p. 488), which have not been found to be recorded in texts. The field name *Bream* (p. 449) may (as the editors suggest) contain ME. *breme*, 'rugged', appearing in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, l. 2145. They suggest that *Hilemire* (p. 87) contains the Lancashire dialect word *hile*, 'clump of plants', used here of rushes (and much the earliest instance, c. 1235, so far noted), which appears in *Pearl*, ll. 41, 1172, 1205 (see also E. V. Gordon's edition of *Pearl*, Oxford, 1953, p. 48). To these dialect words should be added *gote*, 'watercourse', described as 'fairly common in field and minor names' (p. 475), appearing in *Pearl* in ll. 608, 934. To the areas named in *O.E.D.* *tor*, sb. 1, as those in which the Celtic term *tor*, 'high rock, hill', is employed in proper names—namely, Cornwall, Devon, the Peak of Derbyshire, and also Somerset (with Glastonbury Tor)—can now be added Cumberland with its three place-names compounded with *tor* (p. 495); this word too appears in the vocabulary of *Pearl*, which is to be assigned to the southern Pennine region (see E. V. Gordon's edition, p. 75).

It is much to be hoped that the Place-Name Society will continue the policy of including beside the major place-names 'vast numbers of minor names obsolete and current'.

F. E. HARMER

¹ 'Field-Names of Amounderness Hundred: Modern (c. 1840)', a report issued by the committee of the Field-Name Survey of Lancashire and Cheshire, in *Trans. of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, xcvi (1945), 181-222.

SHORT NOTICES

Wandlung des Botenberichts bei Shakespeare. By WOLFGANG CLEMEN. Pp. 46 (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1952, Heft 4). Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1952. No price stated.

This paper is valuable less for its comments on individual plays, sensible though these are, than for the encouragement it gives to follow the development of a single dramatic device through Shakespeare's career. Professor Clemen confines himself to the histories and tragedies, and brings out well the progress from primarily informative messenger-speeches, filling the gaps in the chain of events (p. 8), to those in which the stress is rather on the reactions of other characters and on vivid dramatic give-and-take: *Antony and Cleopatra*, II. v is rightly treated as the culmination of this development. The wider topic of narrative in Shakespeare is touched on, but left for future study (by Professor Clemen himself, one hopes), and messages by letter are rather scantily treated; in this connexion, 3 *Henry VI*, III. iii deserved a mention, especially as it shows a more highly developed dramatic skill than Professor Clemen generally concedes to the earliest histories. Two minor points call for comment. By an oversight on p. 25, *Richard II*, II. ii. 97 is referred to the Duchess of York instead of the Duchess of Gloucester. The quotation on p. 34 is, indeed, by the Cambridge editors, but in their Clarendon Press edition, not, as the wording suggests, in the Cambridge edition.

J. C. MAXWELL

Changeable Scenery. Its Origin and Development in the British Theatre. By RICHARD SOUTHERN. Pp. 411. London: Faber & Faber, 1952. 63s. net.

When I was a boy I remember going to the pantomime and in one particular scene the good fairy waved a wand and a forest dissolved and became a palace with stairways that seemed to be winding in every direction and down these stairways came the most lovely creatures dressed in tights and bejewelled corsages. The transformation was like the unfolding of a flower and every movement led to another that was even more bewildering and spectacular. The whole transformation took place before our eyes. How was it all done? By magic? No; just by the simple skill of a few carpenters who had been brought up in the tradition and spirit of the theatre.

The day of the transformation scene is over. To my knowledge there are only two or three old, very old men left who know exactly how it was all done and they have not practised for some twenty years. But there is a spark of hope left for those keen students of the theatre who are frightened that these traditions will die out completely, because a young man, Richard Southern, has for some years been collecting material on the history of stage scenery and machinery and has published this book on the subject. It is beautifully illustrated with fifty-nine plates, many of which have not been reproduced before, and with about forty delightful little sketches reminiscent of those made by Pierre Sourel for his *Traité de scénographie*.

In his acknowledgements Mr. Southern says '... without W. J. Lawrence this book would not have the present form nor, possibly, an existence at all'. Lawrence and I had been collecting material on this subject for many years. I kept to the Italian Theatre, Lawrence to the English Theatre. When he died it was feared that his most valuable research might get scattered, indeed some of it did, but Richard Southern had access to the great man's note-books and he has passed on to us much of their contents together with his own conclusions. The book has only one fault: it lacks the gay enthusiasm which Lawrence used to put into his works, an essential ingredient to anything in and around theatres. The author seems to emerge from every page wearing a 'property' mortar-board

and carrying a magnifying glass in order to 'discuss' things that my old carpenter friends have expounded with sparkling eyes over a cup of tea.

It is a grand piece of work that will be of great use to all students of theatre history who can afford three guineas.

EDWARD CARRICK

Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications. New Series. Volume IV, 1950. Pp. 60. Oxford: University Press, for the Society, 1952. No price given.

The most important paper in this volume is devoted to a study by Mr. R. F. Ovenell of that portion of his library which Brian Twyne bequeathed to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, at his death in 1644. Brian Twyne was grandson of the John Twyne, antiquary, schoolmaster, and sometime Mayor of Canterbury, who played an important part in securing some of the contents of the monastic libraries dispersed at the Dissolution; he certainly inherited his grandfather's antiquarian interests, for he brought together a mass of material relating to the University of Oxford which he bequeathed to it and which Anthony Wood used extensively. The books that by the terms of his will went to his college were, it is to be remembered, 'all such bookes that they [i.e. the college] have not in their library', and the list compiled by Mr. Ovenell (on the basis of the inscriptions placed in the books at the time, for no contemporary inventory appears to have been drawn up) emerges in fact therefore as a catalogue of only a part—some 350 volumes—of Twyne's library. While interesting it must be used obviously with great caution as evidence in building up a picture of Twyne's library as a whole or as indicating Twyne's literary interests or tastes.

C. E. WRIGHT

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

ANGLIA

Band lxxi, Heft 3, 1953

Gold und Manneswert in Beowulf (Ernst Leisi), pp. 259-73.

Das Schattenmotiv bei Shakespeare (Maria Wickert), pp. 274-309.

Das Laubenmotiv bei Shakespeare und Spenser (Karl Hammerle), pp. 310-30.

Eigenart und Grenzen von Miltons Bildersprache (Robert Fricker), pp. 331-45.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

Vol. xxxvi, No. 1, September 1953

Public and private problems in modern drama (Ronald Peacock), pp. 38-55.

Les manuscrits autographes de deux œuvres de Lorenzo Guglielmo Traversagni imprimées chez Caxton (José Ruysschaert), pp. 191-7.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xv, No. 1, December 1953

Thomas Warton and William Collins: a footnote (J. S. Cunningham), pp. 22-24.

ELH

Vol. xx, No. 4, December 1953

The art of reading medieval personification-allegory (Robert Worth Frank, Jr.), pp. 237-50.

The idea of history in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* (Irving Ribner), pp. 251-66.

The importance of Shaftesbury (Ernest Tuveson), pp. 267-99.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxiv, No. 6, December 1953

The Old English vowel phonemes (Karl Brunner), pp. 247-51.

The expression of reciprocity (Simeon Potter), pp. 252-7.

On some synchronic problems of semantics (O. Funke), pp. 258-61.

The problem of the 'hard words' (Ernst Leisi), pp. 262-7.

Notes on the intonation of coordinate sentences and syntactic groups (Maria Schubiger), pp. 268-73.

Remarks upon field work for an English linguistic atlas of England (Harold Orton), pp. 274-8.

Anglicisms in the Catalan language of Menorca (A. Badia Margarit), pp. 279-82.

Some special West African English words (Paul Christophersen), pp. 282-91.

ETUDES ANGLAISES

VI^e Année, No. 4, Novembre 1953

Australian literature (A. Norman Jeffares), pp. 289-314.

La Perle. Essai d'interprétation nouvelle (L. Le Grelle), pp. 315-31.

La pensée de Marlowe dans *Tam-burlaine the Great* (Jean Jacquot), pp. 332-45.

Un poème inédit de A. E. Housman: *Sir Walter Raleigh* (W. White), pp. 346-9.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xvii, No. 1, November 1953

The craftsmanship and theological significance of Milton's *Art of Logic* (Thomas S. K. Scott-Craig), pp. 1-16.

Warburton and Brown continue the battle over ridicule (William Darby Templeman), pp. 17-36.

Pierre Matthieu: another source for Webster (Robert W. Dent), pp. 75-82.

The Huntington MS. of *A Game at Chesse* (George R. Price), pp. 83-88.

MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxii, No. 2, 1953

Story-patterns in some Breton lays (G. V. Smithers), pp. 61-92.

Versions of the Meditations on the Passion ascribed to Richard Rolle (Margery M. Morgan), pp. 93-103.

Keis in *Sawles Warde* (Joy Russell-Smith), pp. 104-10.

Middle English *gawne*: a correction, with some notes (C. T. Onions), pp. 111-13.

Chaucer, Dante, and Boccaccio (J. A. W. Bennett), pp. 114-15.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxviii, No. 7, November 1953

The use of stoical doctrines in *Ras-selas*, Chapter XVIII (Gwin J. Kolb), pp. 439-47.

Lemuel Gulliver: middle-class Englishman (Edward A. Block), pp. 474-7.

William Godwin's writing for the *New Annual Register* (Jack W. Marken), pp. 477-9.

The geographical chapter in *Scriblerus* (Alan Dugald McKillop), pp. 480-1.

'Wondrous strange snow'—*Mid-summer-Night's Dream*, v. i. 66 (S. K. Heninger, Jr.), pp. 481-3.

A passage in *Pericles* (Robert J. Kane), pp. 483-4.

Milton on conjugal love among the heavenly angels (E. L. Marilla), pp. 485-6.

Vol. lxxviii, No. 8, December 1953

Concerning 'houres twelve' (Bertrand H. Bronson), pp. 515-21.

Chaucer and the *Gawain*-poet: a conjecture (Coolidge Otis Chapman), pp. 521-4.

Chaucer and the London bell-founders (Robert Worth Frank, Jr.), pp. 524-8.

Pearl, 382: *mare rez mysse*? (Sister Mary Vincent), pp. 528-31.

Chaucer and *Mandeville's Travels* (Josephine Waters Bennett), pp. 531-4.

The *hevenlich mede* in Chaucer's

'Truth' (James F. Ragan), pp. 534-5.
Beowulf 3150 (George J. Engelhardt),
 pp. 535-8.

A note on the 'Balade to Saynt Wer-
 burge' (Curt F. Bühler), pp. 538-9.
Invlatide < onfunde? (Francis P.
 Magoun, Jr.), pp. 540-1.

[*Beowulf* 2226]

Browning on Chaucer (Thomas A.
 Kirby), pp. 552-3.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xiv, No. 3, September 1953

The influence of Mason's *Heroic*
Epistle (Martin S. Day), pp. 235-52.
 Keats's Saturn: person or statue?
 (Newell F. Ford), pp. 253-7.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. xlix, No. 1, January 1954

Chaucer's nameless knight (Francis
 G. Townsend), pp. 1-4.

Isaac Newton as phonetician (Ralph
 W. V. Elliott), pp. 5-12.

Three Shakespearian notes (Terence
 Spencer), pp. 46-51.

'Goddess humane' ('Paradise Lost'
 IX. 732) (Ants Oras), pp. 51-53.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. li, No. 2, November 1953

The *Clerk's Tale*: the monsters and
 the critics (James Sledd), pp. 73-82.

The double plot in *Volpone* (Jonas A.
 Barish), pp. 83-92.

'New frame and various composi-
 tion': development in the form of
 Owen Felltham's *Resolves* (McCrea
 Hazlett), pp. 93-101.

'Leda and the Swan': a Longinian
 analysis (Hoyt Trowbridge), pp.
 118-29.

[The poem by Yeats]

NEOPHILOLOGUS

37ste Jaarg., Afl. 4, 1 October 1953

Joseph Conrad's western eye (A. G.
 H. Bachrach), pp. 219-26.

[Continued from xxxvii. 157-66]

NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION

Vol. viii, No. 3, December 1953

Recent criticism of Dickens (Fred W.
 Boege), pp. 171-87.

Russian translations of nineteenth-
 century English fiction (Kenneth E.
 Harper and Bradford A. Booth), pp.
 188-97.

Mr. Pickwick and the seven deadly
 sins (H. N. Maclean), pp. 198-212.

Insight, the essence of Jane Austen's
 artistry (Louise D. Cohen), pp.
 213-24.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. cxviii, No. 11, November 1953

'Macbeth' conjectures (Howard Par-
 sons), pp. 464-6.

Three early settings of Jonson (Mac-
 donald Emslie), pp. 466-8.

Essays from Fielding's 'Champion'
 (J. B. Shipley), pp. 468-9.

A letter from John Milton to George
 Wither? (Lyle H. Kendall, Jr.), p.
 473.

A note on the meaning of 'novel' in
 the seventeenth century (John J.
 O'Connor), pp. 477-8.

Sentiment in Crowne's 'The Married
 Beau' (William M. Peterson), pp.
 483-5.

Swift, Tisdall, and 'A Narrative'
 (Oliver W. Ferguson), pp. 485-6.

Burns's 'Jolly Beggars'—a mistaken
 interpretation (Allan H. MacLaine),
 pp. 486-7.

Joseph Paice, subject of Lamb's
 'Modern Gallantry', further identi-
 fied (Vedder M. Gilbert), pp. 489-90.

Charles Lamb and William Ireland
 (Sylvan Barnet), p. 491.

Browning and Donne (Robert Lid-
 dell Lowe), pp. 491-2.

R. D. Blackmore (Waldo H. Dunn),
 p. 492.

Conrad's 'Victory' and 'Hamlet'
 (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 492-3.

Vol. cxviii, No. 12, December 1953

Retribution in English medieval drama (Daniel C. Boughner), pp. 506-8.

Repetition in Barnaby Retch (Edwin H. Miller), pp. 511-12.

Shakespeare and Plutarch's 'Life of Pelopidas' (Joseph S. Stull), pp. 512-13.

Holland's Pliny and 'Othello' (Kenneth Muir), pp. 513-14.

Shakespeare's bear 'Sackerson' (Frederick G. Blair), pp. 514-15.

Milton and the Duke of York (Edward L. Ruhe), pp. 524-5.

Goldsmith and the Marquis d'Argens (Philip Harth), pp. 529-30.

John Payne Collier and his fabrications (Sydney Race), pp. 531-4.

The misfortunes of Hood: 1841 (K. J. Fielding), pp. 534-6.

Edward Walford: a distressed editor (William E. Buckler), pp. 536-8.

[Of *Once a Week*]

Vol. i, New Series, No. 1, January 1954

Charles Butler and Du Bartas (Nan Cooke Carpenter), pp. 2-7.

The Judgment of Paris as a device of Tudor flattery (John D. Reeves), pp. 7-11.

Robert Nicholson, a minor Macenas (Franklin B. Williams, Jr.), pp. 11-13.

[Elizabethan book collector and literary patron]

Another look at Simon Eyre's will (Merritt E. Lawlis), pp. 13-16.

William Painter's use of Mexia (J. C. Maxwell), p. 16.

A note on Spenser and Pope (Wolfgang Bernard Fleischmann), pp. 16-17.

George Herbert's 'Caller' (G. P. V. Akrigg), p. 17.

Massinger's reference to the Calverley story (Glenn H. Blayney), pp. 17-18.

'A Warning for Faire Women' (Line 143) (Arthur O. Lewis, Jr.), pp. 18-19.

Notes on Lyly's 'Campaspe' and Shakespeare (A. Davenport), pp. 19-20.

Freedom and slavery in 'Othello' (Kenneth Muir), pp. 20-21.

The 'haunch' of winter (C. Overbury Fox), p. 21.

[2 *Henry IV*, iv. iv. 91-93]

Hall: 'Virgidemiarum' (iv. i. 171-2) (J. C. Maxwell), p. 25.

'Determinate sentence' in Milton's 'Of Education' (David S. Berkeley), pp. 25-26.

A note on Milton and Dryden as satirists (Morris Freedman), pp. 26-27.

Two parallels between Dryden's 'Wild Gallant' and Congreve's 'Love for Love' (Arthur L. Cooke), pp. 27-28.

A Cowper letter in Dublin (Michael J. O'Neill), p. 28.

Samuel Richardson and 'Pamela' (John B. Shipley), pp. 28-29.

Another source of 'The Revolt of Islam' (Ben W. Griffith, Jr.), pp. 29-30.

Shelley's 'eagle home' (Norman Nathan), p. 30.

Further tributes and allusions in verse to Keats (1876-1943) (David Bonnell Green), pp. 30-31.

Thackeray on Swift and Macaulay on Chatham (B. R. McElderry, Jr.), p. 32.

A note on W. B. Yeats's 'Sailing to Byzantium' (Allan Donaldson), pp. 34-35.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxii, No. 4, October 1953

Concerning *The Owl and the Nightingale* (R. M. Lumiansky), pp. 411-17.

222 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

A check-list of supplements to Spurgeon's Chaucer allusions (William L. Alderson), pp. 418-27.

Bulwer-Lytton and the school of catastrophe (Curtis Dahl), pp. 428-42.

The date of composition of Browning's *Love Among the Ruins* (Johnstone Parr), pp. 443-6.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHRONICLE

Vol. xv, No. 1, Autumn 1953

Jonathan Sturges (Leon Edel), pp. 1-9.

[Friend of Henry James]

On rereading *Barchester Towers* (Robert H. Taylor), pp. 10-15.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxviii, No. 5, December 1953

Henry James's world of images (R. W. Short), pp. 943-60.

Robert Browning and the experimental drama (James Patton McCormick), pp. 982-91.

An early champion of Wordsworth: Thomas Noon Talfourd (William S. Ward), pp. 992-1000.

William Hazlitt as a critic of prose fiction (Charles I. Patterson), pp. 1001-16.

Jane Austen and the peerage (D. J. Greene), pp. 1017-31.

Smollett and the *Atom* (James R. Foster), pp. 1032-46.

Edmund Burke and Charles Lucas (Gaetano L. Vincitorio), pp. 1047-55.

The damnation of Othello (Paul N. Siegel), pp. 1068-78.

The structure of *The Faerie Queene* (W. J. B. Owen), pp. 1079-1100.

'Christis Kirk', 'Pebelis to the Play', and the German peasant-brawl (George Fenwick Jones), pp. 1101-25.

Chaucer shortens a tale (W. Nelson Francis), pp. 1126-41.

A period in the development of the *Canterbury Tales* marriage group and of blocks B² and C (Germaine Dempster), pp. 1142-59.

The structure and the unity of *Beowulf* (Arthur G. Brodeur), pp. 1183-95.

The anti-Semitic Limerick incidents and Joyce's 'Blossomsday' (Marvin Magalaner), pp. 1219-23.

Local allusions in Joyce's *Ulysses* (Joseph Prescott), pp. 1223-8.

Robert Buchanan's critical principles (George G. Storey), pp. 1228-32.

Dryden's 'Cousin Swift' (John Robert Moore and Maurice Johnson), pp. 1232-40.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxi, No. 3, Summer 1953

Shakespeare's arena (Leslie Hotson), pp. 347-61.

Murder in the Cathedral (John Peter), pp. 362-83.

The image as guide to meaning in the historical novel (Andrew Nelson Lytle), pp. 408-26.

Joyce's categories (Ellsworth Mason), pp. 427-32.

Abraham Cowley (1618-1667) (J. C. Ghosh), pp. 433-47.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. I, No. 4, October 1953

Dialect grouping in the unpublished Vercelli homilies (Paul W. Peterson), pp. 559-65.

Defoe's education at Newington Green Academy (Lew Girdler), pp. 573-91.

A *Gulliver* dictionary (Paul Odell Clark), pp. 592-624.

The effect of Shakespeare's influence on Wordsworth's 'The Borderers' (Charles J. Smith), pp. 625-39.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

July-December 1953

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1953 the date of each publication]

- ABRAMS, M. H. *The Mirror and the Lamp*. New York. pp. xiv+406. 45s.
- ARKELL, W. J., and S. I. TOMKIEFF. *English Rock Terms*. pp. xx+139. 21s.
- ARNOLD, M. *Five Uncollected Essays*, ed. K. Allott. Liverpool. pp. xiv+107. 6s.
- BARD, J. (ed.). *Essays by Divers Hands*, N.S., Vol. XXVI. pp. x+155. 12s. 6d.
- BARRETT, C. R. *Studies in the Word Order of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies and Lives of the Saints*. Cambridge. pp. x+135. No price given.
- BAUER, J. *The London Magazine 1820-29*. Copenhagen. pp. 363. Kr. 27.50.
- BENNETT, JOAN. *Four Metaphysical Poets*. [2nd edn.] Cambridge. pp. x+127. 15s.
- BEVINGTON, M. M. (ed.). *Matthew Arnold's England and the Italian Question*. Durham, N.C. pp. xxx+74. 21s.
- BLOOMFIELD, M. W. *The Seven Deadly Sins*. East Lansing, 1952. pp. xiv+482. 60s.
- BOAS, G., and Others. *Studies in Intellectual History*. Baltimore. pp. viii+225. \$3.75.
- BRITISH ACADEMY. *Proceedings*, vol. xxxvii 1951. pp. xii+372. 50s.
- BROSNAHAN, L. F. *Some Old English Sound Changes*. Cambridge. pp. xii+141. 10s. 6d.
- BROWN, W. C. *Charles Churchill*. Lawrence, Ka. pp. x+240. \$4.00.
- BROWNE, Sir T. *Religio Medici*, ed. J. J. Denonain. Cambridge. pp. xlv+120. 25s.
- BULLITT, J. M. *Jonathan Swift and the Anatomy of Satire*. Cambridge, Mass. pp. x+214. 25s.
- BURNS, R. *Selected Letters*, ed. DeLancey Ferguson. pp. xxviii+371. 5s.
- CHAPMAN, R. W. *Jane Austen. A Critical Bibliography*. Oxford. pp. viii+62. 7s. 6d.
- CRAIG, H. *The Written Word and Other Essays*. Chapel Hill. pp. x+90. 24s.
- CROFT-MURRAY, E. *John Devoto*. pp. 16. No price given.
- CURRIER, T. F. *A Bibliography of Oliver Wendell Holmes*, ed. E. M. Tilton. New York. pp. xiv+708. 160s.
- DEKKER, T. *The Dramatic Works*, ed. F. Bowers. Vol. I. Cambridge. pp. xviii+469. 35s.
- DICKASON, D. H. *The Daring Young Men*. Bloomington, Ind. pp. xii+304. \$5.00.
- DONNE, J. *The Sermons*, ed. G. R. Potter and E. M. Simpson. Vol. I. Berkeley, Calif. pp. xiv+354. 56s. 6d.
- DUNCAN, H. D. *Language and Literature in Society*. Chicago. pp. xvi+262. 37s. 6d.
- ELIOT, T. S. *The Three Voices of Poetry*. pp. 24. 3s. 6d.
- ELLEGÅRD, A. *The Auxiliary Do*. Stockholm. pp. 320. Sw. Kr. 18.
- ELLIOTT, G. R. *Flaming Minister. A Study of Othello*. Durham, N.C. pp. xxxvi+245. 34s.
- ENGLISH ASSOCIATION. *The Year's Work in English Studies*, vol. xxxii 1951, ed. F. S. Boas and B. White. pp. 311. 21s.
- FEUILLERAT, A. *The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays*. New Haven. pp. x+340. 32s. 6d.
- FISHMAN, S. *The Disinherited of Art*. Berkeley, Calif. pp. xiv+178. 21s.
- GARMONSWAY, G. N. (trans.). *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. pp. xviii+295. 6s.
- GELLING, M. *The Place-Names of Oxfordshire. Part I*. Cambridge. pp. liv+244. 30s.
- GRYLLS, R. G. *William Godwin and His World*. pp. 256. 21s.
- HANKINS, J. E. *Shakespeare's Derived Imagery*. Lawrence, Ka. pp. x+289. \$5.00.
- HISCOCK, W. G. *John Evelyn and Mrs. Godolphin*. 1951. pp. xii+202. 20s.
- HORDEN, J. *Francis Quarles (1592-1644). A Bibliography*. Oxford. pp. xii+83. No price given.
- HORNE, C. J. (ed.). *Swift on his Age*. pp. 283. 7s. 6d.
- HORSMAN, E. A. (ed.). *The Diary of Alfred Domett 1872-1885*. pp. iv+312. 25s.
- HOTSON, L. (ed.). *Queen Elizabeth's Entertainment at Mitcham*. New Haven. pp. x+57. 20s.
- HOWARTH, R. G. *Literature of the Theatre Marlowe to Shirley*. Sydney. pp. 16. No price given.
- IRVING, E. B., Jr. (ed.). *The Old English Exodus*. New Haven. pp. x+129. 32s. 6d.

- JOAD, C. E. M. (ed.). Shaw and Society. pp. 279. 16s.
- JORDAN, J. E. Thomas De Quincey Literary Critic. Berkeley, Calif., 1952. pp. x+301. 28s.
- KOCHER, P. H. Science and Religion in Elizabethan England. San Marino, Calif. pp. xii+340. \$6.00.
- KÖKERITZ, H. Shakespeare's Pronunciation. New Haven. pp. xvi+516. 48s.
- KRUMPELMANN, J. T. Mark Twain and the German Language. Baton Rouge. pp. iv+21. 50c.
- KURATH, H., and S. M. KUHN (eds.). Middle English Dictionary. Part E. 1. Ann Arbor, 1952. pp. ii+120. 21s.
- Middle English Dictionary. Parts E. 2 and E. 3. Ann Arbor. pp. 121-244; 245-372. 21s. each.
- LASCELLES, M. Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*. pp. x+172. 15s.
- LUTTRELL SOCIETY. Theatre Miscellany. Oxford. pp. viii+129. 25s.
- MOORE, C. A. Backgrounds of English Literature 1700-1760. Minneapolis. pp. xii+254. 36s.
- MUELLER, W. R., and D. C. ALLEN (eds.). That Souveraine Light. Baltimore, 1952. pp. iv+133. 24s.
- ORR, J. Words and Sounds in English and French. Oxford. pp. viii+279. 25s.
- PARR, J. Tamburlaine's Malady. Tuscaloosa, Ala. pp. xiv+158. \$3.50.
- PARTRIDGE, A. C. Studies in the Syntax of Ben Jonson's Plays. Cambridge. pp. x+104. 8s. 6d.
- The Accidence of Ben Jonson's Plays Masques and Entertainments. Cambridge. pp. xiv+333. 21s.
- PINTO, V. DE S. (ed.). Poems by John Wilmot Earl of Rochester. pp. lxx+245. 15s.
- PRAED, W. M. Selected Poems, ed. K. Allott. pp. lxx+362. 18s.
- PRESSON, R. K. Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and the Legends of Troy. Madison, Wis. pp. x+165. \$2.50.
- PRICE, M. Swift's Rhetorical Art. New Haven. pp. x+115. 30s.
- REINHOLD, H. Humoristische Tendenz in der englischen Dichtung des Mittelalters. Tübingen. pp. viii+161. DM. 16.60.
- REYNOLDS, G. F. Plays as Literature for an Audience. Boulder, Col. pp. 51. \$1.50.
- RICHARDSON, W. C. Stephen Vaughan Financial Agent of Henry VIII. Baton Rouge. pp. xii+106. \$1.50.
- ROBSON-SCOTT, W. D. German Travellers in England 1400-1800. Oxford. pp. xii+238. 31s. 6d.
- ROTA, F. William Collins. Padua. pp. vi+173. L. 900.
- ROWSE, A. L. An Elizabethan Garland. pp. viii+162. 15s.
- RUDSKOGER, A. Fair, Foul, Nice, Proper. Stockholm, 1952. pp. xii+505. Sw. Kr. 25.
- SCHMIDT, K. Vorstudien zu einer Geschichte des komischen Epos. Halle. pp. vi+204. DM. 15.
- Anglistische Bücherkunde. Tübingen. pp. iv+60. DM. 3.80.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. Lectures on Four of Shakespeare's History Plays. By L. J. Owen, A. E. Claeysens, W. M. Schutte and W. F. Keirce. Pittsburgh. pp. viii+69. No price given.
- Titus Andronicus, ed. J. C. Maxwell. pp. xlvi+129. 18s.
- SHINE, H. Carlyle's Early Reading, To 1834. Lexington, Ky. pp. viii+353. No price given.
- SMITH, D. F. The Critics in the Audience of the London Theatres from Buckingham to Sheridan. Albuquerque. pp. 192. \$1.50.
- SMITH, N. C. (ed.). The Letters of Sydney Smith. Oxford. 2 vols. pp. xxxii+492; xviii+493-890. 84s. the two vols.
- STEIN, W. B. Hawthorne's Faust. Gainesville, Fla. pp. x+172. \$4.50.
- SUTHERLAND, J. (ed.). The Oxford Book of English Talk. Oxford. pp. xx+453. 18s.
- SWAMINATHAN, S. R. Keats's *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*. Saugar Univ. Jour., I. 1-15.
- WASSERMAN, E. R. The Finer Tone. Keats' Major Poems. Baltimore, 1952. pp. viii+228. 32s.
- WATTS, H. W. Hound and Quarry. pp. viii+304. 21s.
- WHALLEY, G. Poetic Process. pp. xl+256. 21s.
- WILKS, J. The Influence of R. W. Chambers on the Development of University Libraries. pp. 18. 3s. 6d.
- WILKINS, G. The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre, ed. K. Muir. Liverpool. pp. xvi+120. 6s.
- YOUNG, P. Ernest Hemingway. pp. xii+244. 12s. 6d.

ughan
Baton

vellers
. pp.

. pp.

uriland.

roper.
w. Kr.

r Ge-
e. pp.

ingen.

our of
L. J.
chutte
viii +

xwell.

g, To
3. No

dience
cking-
p. 192.

ydney
+ 492;

aines-

ook of
3. 181.
Belle
Jour.,

Tone.
1952.

. pp.

+ 256.

Cham-
ersity

res of
Muir.

xii +